# *On the Sounds and Inflections of the Cyprian Dialect*

---

*C. E. Bennett*

## III. — *On the Sounds and Inflections of the Cyprian Dialect.*

By CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Dr. Isaac H. Hall in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society* for October, 1877, stated the wants existing at that stage of Cyprian study as 1) a complete collection of inscriptions, 2) a correct syllabary, 3) a compilation of the best interpretations; after which, grammar and vocabulary. The first and second of these wants have been admirably met by Deecke's publication of the existing inscriptions with an appended syllabary in Collitz's *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. Bd. I., Heft 1, 1883. The excellent foundation laid by this brilliant and thorough work has encouraged the present attempt at a systematic treatment of the grammar of the dialect.

The inscriptions made use of, in addition to those published in Collitz's *Sammlung* (212 in number), have been the following:—

1. The two inscriptions with fragments of two others published by Sayce in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1884, No. 21.

2. Three inscriptions published by Hans Voigt in the *Studia Nicolaitana*, 1884.

3. Thirty inscriptions published by Deecke in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1886, Nos. 41, 51, 52.

4. The two bilingual inscriptions of Tamassus, published by Deecke in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1886, No. 42; 1887, No. 12.

5. Meister's new reading (suggested by Deecke) of inscription 41 in Collitz's *Sammlung*, in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1887, No. 52.

6. The two inscriptions published by Deecke in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, xi., p. 315 f.

7. The reading of COLLITZ 134 as published by Prellwitz in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, ix., p. 172.

The inscriptions discovered in Cyprus during the last year have not as yet been published. It is to be hoped that they may add to our knowledge of the dialect.

As regards the inscriptions published by Deecke in Collitz's *Sammlung*, I have been compelled to doubt the general correctness of one or two of the longer ones, and mention this here that more weight may attach to what is urged below against particular forms occurring in these inscriptions. The inscriptions are Nos. 68, 69, and 126.

No. 68 is the longest of the inscriptions in the Cesnola collection in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. The characters are quite clear in the main, to judge from Hall's fac-simile (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, x., Plate iv., 13). The divisors are also plain. But unmistakable as several of the words of the inscription seem to be, *e.g.* χαίρετε, line 1; θεοῖς, line 2; ἄ(ν)θρωπε and θεῶι, line 3; πά(ν)τα and ἄ(ν)θρωποι, line 4, yet there are other words exceedingly doubtful, especially πότι, ῥήπω, ἐρείσης in line 1; ἐρεραμένα and πα(ν)τακόραστος in line 2; οὐ, ἐπισταῖς, ἀλ(λ)' ἔτυχ' ἁ κήρ in line 3; and κυμερῆναι and φρονέωί in line 4. These words are doubtful not only from the uncertainty of some of the characters contained in them, but more especially in view of their peculiar and irregular formation (see below for the separate cases). Furthermore the interpretation which Deecke seeks to establish for the whole inscription (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 78 ff.) is so forced and far-fetched, that I cannot believe the reading which yields such a sense to be correct. Several words as πότι and ἐπισταῖς, even if formally correct, cannot have the signification which Deecke attributes to them. Even the metrical structure of the verses (Deecke claims four hexameters) to which Deecke appeals for the confirmation of his results, is extremely harsh, involving the lengthening of the final ι of πότι, the lengthening of

the ι of τὶ, the shortening of the second syllable of ἐπῐστα῀ις,[1] the crasis of θεῶι[2] ἀλ(λ)', besides two striking instances of hiatus.

In view of all these difficulties I cannot believe that the true reading of this difficult inscription has yet been reached, and I have therefore felt it unsafe to attempt to base any grammatical conclusions upon it, at least for the present. An irregularity or two in an inscription otherwise certain (*e.g.* αἴλων Coll. 60, 14; ἀζαθᾶι 59, 4) may be easily admitted; but to admit the existence of irregularities in any number in an inscription which is thereby made to yield only an unsatisfactory sense, reduces the probability of the correctness of any one word to a minimum.

No. 69, though apparently accepted without reservation by Hall (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xi., p. 221), seems to me to be open to precisely the same objections as urged against No. 68, including faulty metrical structure.

No. 126 is uncertain in several of the characters, and a number of the words as read by Deecke involve principles at variance with the usage of the dialect. The sense too is not convincing.

No. 41 is now taken by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317) as reading from left to right, instead of from right to left as formerly. This gives an entirely different text, which has not yet been fully made out. Meister, following Deecke, has offered in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1887, No. 52, a new reading of the inscription. But this is largely conjectural and to be accepted with caution.

Nos. 122–125 have been shown by Voigt (*Bezz. Beitr.*, ix., p. 168) to be in all likelihood cleverly executed forgeries, and will accordingly be left entirely out of consideration.

[1] This is Deecke's explanation, but it is simpler to assume aphæresis of the initial ε.

[2] Equally harsh would be the assumption of synizesis in θεω̃ι, with shortening before the initial vowel.

## SOUNDS.

### Vowels.

#### 1.

#### ă.

Cyprian ă corresponds in general to primitive Greek ă and ă of the other dialects; *e.g.* *à(ν)τί* Coll. 60, 5; *βασιλεύς* 17, 1; *ϝάναξ* 18, 1.

1. *δάλτον* Coll. 60, 26 appears in other dialects as *δέλτος*, being derived from the name of the letter delta (*τὸ δέλτα*). The Semitic name of the letter, however, is *daleth*, and it is doubtless owing to the influence of the Phœnician dialect of Cyprus, that the Cyprian Greeks employed the form *δάλτος* while the others said *δέλτος*.

2. Whether *ἰαρός* as in Doric, Elean, Bœotian, Thessalian and Arcadian (in the latter by the side of *ἱερός*) really exists in Cyprian is as yet uncertain. Of Deecke's three forms *Ἰαρώ(ν)δαν* Coll. 118; *ἰαρώτατος* 41, 1; and *jαρά* 72, 2, the first is entirely uncertain, and the second no longer maintained by Deecke himself (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317). Only the last of the three, *jαρά*, can lay claim to serious attention. Whether *jαρά* can be for *i̯jαρά* (*i.e.* *ἰαρά*; see § 18, 1) is extremely doubtful. The only theory on which we could account for the disappearance of the initial ι, would be that it merged in some way with the final ι of the preceding *Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι*. This may be correct in spite of the divisor, *viz.* *a·po·lo·ni·* | *ja·ra·*. *Cf.* Coll. 26 *e·mi·* | *o·la·o·* — *i.e.* possibly *ἠμὶ Ἰολάω*. *Cf.* Deecke, *Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 83.

The regular Cyprian form is *ἱερός* (*i̯jερός*); *e.g.* *i̯jερεύς* Coll. 40; *ἱερῆος* 38, 3, *et pass.* None of the forms in *i̯jερ-* ever show any tendency to lose their initial vowel and to appear as *jερ-*.

As to the relation of the two forms ἱερός and ἰαρός, it seems quite probable, in view of Skrt. *iṣirá-*, that the latter is the primitive one, and that ἱερός is of secondary origin, with *-ερος* for *-αρος* after the analogy of φοβερός, δολερός, τρομερός, *etc.* This is Osthoff's view. See *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, iv., p. 149 ff. *Cf.* Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 94.

**3.** κατάστησε COLL. 127 cannot be a Cyprian form for κατέστᾱσε. The syllabic text seems to give *ka·ta·se·te·se·*. But the principles of the Cyprian syllabary would demand *ka·ta·sa·te·se·* to represent κατάστησε. This has led Voigt (*Bezz. Beitr.*, ix., p. 170) to conjecture a mistake of the stone-cutter, by which the *ta·* and *te·* in the second and fourth syllables were interchanged. In that case we should get *ka·te·se·ta·se·*, *i.e.* κατέστᾱσε, — the regular form, found frequently in other Cyprian inscriptions, *e.g.* COLL. 27, 2; 28.

**4.** Equally uncertain is πα(ν)τακόραστος, the reading proposed by Deecke in COLL. 68, 2, which he takes (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 79) for παντακόρεστος, *i.e.* an emphatic ἀκόρεστος, for which Deecke compares παντάριστος, *etc.* But this change of ε to α is difficult to justify either physiologically or by any etymological combinations. Moreover, the word is suspicious in its composition. παντάριστος, which Deecke compares, is not sufficiently analogous to give much probability to his view of the word. We ought to have instances of some verbal beginning with alpha privative, to which παντ- has been prefixed, such as παντ-άβατος, παντ-άκριτος, before crediting so remarkable a form as παντ-α-κόρεστος, even did it occur with ε, and not α, as here. Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 220) after a careful re-examination of the inscription in New York reads here πά(ν)τα χώραι δῶς, taking Deecke's *sa·* as an *i·*, which he insists is correct. But δῶς surely cannot be right.

**5.** As to the possible origin of the peculiar ending *-αν*, in the acc. sing. of consonant stems, from *-ᾰν* (*cf.* ἔταμον for ἔ-τᾰμ-ον), see below, under *Inflections*, § 29, 1.

**6.** The α in μεμναμένοι COLL. 71, 2 must be taken as short, if the inscription (with Allen, *Versification in Greek Inscrip-*

*tions*, p. 46) is really to be regarded as metrical, which I doubt. Allen's view requires us to assume the addition of ἐγώ in verse 1 and the interpolation of either παι or εὖ in verse 2, along with the shortening of ᾱ to ᾰ in μεμναμένοι. This seems to me improbable, especially as thereby we gain only rough verses at best.

7. ῥέζαθι, Hall's reading of COLL. 70 (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 221), which he takes as imperative of ῥέζω ("do sacrifice") is not in the smallest degree probable.

## 2.

### ᾱ.

Cyprian ᾱ appears in εὐχωλᾶς COLL. 59, 4; ἔστᾱσαν 71; κᾶρυξ 65, *et pass.*

1. Final -ᾱι (*i.c.* -ᾳ) sometimes appears as ᾱ by the disappearance of the ι. For the examples, see below, under *Diphthongs*, § 11, 4, 2); 13, 3. Whether this change ever occurred in the interior of a word is extremely doubtful. Deecke thinks he finds an instance in Ἄδη COLL. 126, which he takes for Ἄιδηι (*i.c.* Ἄιδῃ). But the other difficulties of the passage τὸ(ν) δόμε(ν) Ἄ(ι)δη(ι) μισαάτω (see below, § 23, 4; 26, 3) are so great that small probability attaches to the correctness of this particular form.

## 3.

### ε.

Instances of regular ε are γένοιτυ COLL. 60, 29; δεξίωι 37, 2; γε 56; ὀνέθηκε 72, 1.

1. Ἀριστοκρέτης COLL. 71; Στασικρέτεος (gen.) *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 68; Τιμοκρέτεος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, II., viii.; Φιλοκρέτεος *ibid.* vii.; Τιμοκρέ[τεος] *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 52, xxi., have ε where the other dialects have α (Ἀριστοκράτης *etc.*). COLL. 148 has . . . *ke · re · te · se ·*, apparently the conclusion of a proper name in -κρέτης, the first part of which is lost. Τιμοκρέτης COLL. 121 is very uncertain. Besides forms in -κρέτης forms in -κράτης also occur, *e.g.* Στασικράτης COLL. 17, 1; Στασικράτεος 18, 2.

These two formations represent two different forms of the suffix, *κρετ-* (strong) and *κρατ-* (weak). The original inflection,

nom. *-κρέτης*,
gen. *-κράτεος* (for **-κρατέος*, *i.e.* **-κr̥tésos*),

has become modified by the "levelling" process (*cf.* Wheeler, *Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language*, p. 21 ff.). In most Greek dialects the levelling took place in favor of the strong form *-κρετ-*. The Cyprian is peculiar in that it has levelled both ways, and so developed two inflections,

| | |
|---|---|
| *-κρέτης* | *-κράτης* |
| *-κρέτεος* | *-κράτεος* |

as shown by the above examples. (*Cf.* the Anglo-Saxon præterite *sang*, plural *sungun;* whence by similar levelling we get in modern English the two inflections *sang* and *sung*.) These were probably local differences. The close relationship of the Arcadian to the Cyprian is shown by the occurrence of proper names in both *-κρέτης* and *-κράτης* in that dialect also, *e.g.* Αὐτοκρέτης Coll. 1246, D, 17; Καλλικρέτης 1246, B, 15; Σωκρέτης 1231, C, 1; Καλλικρέτεος 1246, B, 3; Ἀριστοκράτης 1181, A, 12.

**2.** *κε* Coll. 60, 10, 23, 29. As primitive form of this particle we must assume *κέν* found in Homer and Lesbian. This was doubtless originally orthotone. By its side stood the weak form *κᾰ* (*i.e.* *kn̥*), enclitic, preserved in Bœotian, Cretan, Heraclean, Laconian, Elean, and Locrian. The form *κε* can only be explained (with Spitzer, *Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 8, and Osthoff, *Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen*, p. 328) as a compromise between these two forms *κέν* and *κα*, a "*Contaminationsbildung.*" Parallel with Doric, Bœotian, and Elean *κᾰ*, as weak form of *κέν*, occurs Thessalian *μᾰ* (*i.e.* *mn̥*) as weak form of *μέν*, in the sense of δέ; *e.g.* Coll. 326, 3; 345, 20, *et pass.* *Cf.* Prellwitz, *De dialecto Thessalica*, p. 48; Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 24, 1). So also the Homeric and Attic *μά* as a particle of asseveration, *e.g.* *ναὶ μὰ τόδε σκῆπτρον* A 234; *ναὶ μὰ Δία* Ar. *Achar.* 88. Even in the

strong form μέν, we see in Homer, and occasionally in Attic, unmistakable evidence of the same affirmatory force, which was original to this particle.

That in these latter instances a "*Contaminationsbildung*" μέ has not been developed, must be ascribed to the early differentiation in the meanings of μέν and μά, and the consequent feeling that they were separate words, while κέν and κα, as long as they existed side by side, remained identical in signification.

3. Σελαμινί[ων], on coins, COLL. 176, 177, and Σελαμίνιος, Sayce in *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1884, No. 21, have ε, while Σαλαμίνιος, COLL. 148, represents the vulgar formation. The ε is probably attributable to Semitic influence. Deecke (on 176) compares Σελαμίν, a town in Galilee. The reading of COLL. 121, where Deecke suggests Σαλαμίνιος, is quite uncertain.

4. ὡρίσετυ (aor., = ὡρίσατο) COLL. 126, 1 has not developed its ε from α by any phonetic process, but is simply an illustration of the tendency, occasionally exhibited by the sigmatic aorist, to assume the thematic formation. (*Cf.* the same phenomenon in Homer, *e.g.* ἐπιβήσετο ζ 78; δύσετο Γ 328). Perhaps the Cyprian form is due directly to Homeric influence, as is undoubtedly the case with a number of words in this dialect. See § 20, 1.

5. ὁσέϳα COLL. 41, formerly taken by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 71 f.) for ὁσεία, another form of ὅσιος, is now read by him quite differently. See *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317.

6. For Deecke's ε in the inflection of nouns in -εύς, η is rather to be written, *e.g.* βασιλῆϝος not βασιλέϝος. See below, under *Inflections*, § 28.

7. The Cyprian name of the town of Citium was Κέτιον, as seen in Κετίων (gen. sing.) COLL. 59, 1; Κετιῆϝες 60, 1. So also the abbreviated Κετι. 57 and Κε. 195 on a coin.

## 4.

### η.

Cyprian η corresponds regularly to primitive Greek η and to η of the other dialects (except to that Attic and Ionic η

which has arisen from primitive Greek ᾱ), *e.g.* *κασίγνητοι* Coll. 71 ; *ἰjατῆραν* 60, 3 ; *Στασικράτης* 17, 1.

1. *Ἄδη* is read by Deecke in Coll. 126. He takes it for *Ἄ(ι)δη(ι)* (see § 2, 1 ; 13, 3, b). But this involves questionable principles in the case of the word itself, and the context is uncertain, so that Deecke's reading can only be regarded as conjectural. If correct, the word might be referred to Homeric influence. See § 20, 1.

2. *Μοισίδημος* Coll. 127 is very uncertain and can be correct only on the assumption that it is an Ionic name. On *κατάστησε* in the same inscription, see above, § 1, 3.

3. *ἐρείσης* Coll. 68, 2, taken by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 79) as gen. sing. of **ἔρεισος*, *i.e.* *ἴσος* (*cf.* Hom. *νῆες ἐΐσαι* for **ἐρῖσαι*) cannot be correct in its η. The inscription, moreover, has elsewhere ᾱ, according to Deecke's own reading, *e.g.* *θνατοῖς*, *ἀ*. On other objections to the word, see below, under *Diphthongs*, § 12, 2.

4. *ἰθονίκη* Coll. 41, 3, formerly taken by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 71, 5) as for *ἰθυνίκη* ('straight victory'), disappears with the changed reading of that inscription (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317).

5. The Ionic η in Hall's *Εὐδᾱμωδότης* (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 229 = Coll. 101) cannot be correct, especially with the non-Ionic ᾱ in the second syllable. *Τιμοδωρήτης* *ibid.* p. 231 (Coll. 121) is doubtful and improbable.

6. *Θεητονίκω* Coll. 128 is apparently correct and, if so, to be explained as an Ionic name.

7. *συλήση* (for *συλήσῃ* ; see § 13, 3, b) Coll. 126, 2, is to be referred to *συλέω*, not *συλάω*, and hence its η presents no irregularity. The tendency of verbs originally ending in *-άω* to change to verbs in *-έω* is abundantly illustrated by the evidence of other dialects, *e.g.* Cretan *μοικίων* (*i.e.* *μοιχέων*) instead of *μοικάων* in the Gortynian inscription, II., 21 ; *τιμίουσα* (*i.e.* *τιμέουσα*) for *τιμάουσα*, Cauer, *Delectus*[2] 132, 22 ; *συλέν* (*i.e.* *συλέ-εν*) *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1885, 10, 8 (*cf.* Herforth, *De dialecto Cretica*, in *Dissertationes Halenses*, 1887, p. 279) ; Delphian *συλέοντες* Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] 211, 17, *et pass.*

**8.** The name of the city Idalium appears in Cyprian always as 'Ηδάλιον; so Coll. 60, 1, 27; 'Ηδαλίων (gen. sing.) 59, 1; 'Ηδαλιοῖ (loc.) 62, 1; the inhabitants, 'Ηδαλιῆϝες 60, 2; 'Ηδαλιῆϳι 60, 31; abbreviated 'Ηδαλι. 205; 206. In 60, 16, 26 Deecke (*ad loc.*) takes the syllable *e·* as standing for the adjective 'Ηδάλια or 'Ηδαλιακά. The only reason for transcribing the *e·* here as 'H- instead of 'E- lies in the fact that 'Ιδάλιον as found in classic Greek always occurs with long initial vowel.

**9.** Deecke in Coll. 68, 1 reads ϝήπω as aor. subjunctive (= Att. εἴπω). Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxvi., p. 17) had already proposed ϝέπω, which he explained as present indicative. Deecke suggested ϝήπω on metrical grounds. But the word cannot be correct. The Cyprian form would not be ϝήπω, as Deecke maintains (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 79, 5), but ϝείπω, with ει as in Attic. Cyprian has η only as the equivalent of the Attic ει arising by compensative lengthening or contraction (see below, § 14, 7; 15) not as the equivalent of the genuine diphthong ει, which εἶπον had. That the ει did not arise here by contraction from *ἐ-ϝέ-ϝεπ-ον or *ἔ-ϝε-ϝπ-ον, but was the genuine diphthong ει, is shown by the Old Attic ΕΙΠΕΝ CIA. iv., 22, b, 4 (450 B.C.) and frequently (see Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*[1], p. 79, Anm. 648); also by Lesbian ϝείπην, the tradition in Alcæus 55, Sappho 28 (Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*[3]).

**10.** On η for ηι (*i.e.* ῃ) in the 3d sing. of the subjunctive, see below, under *Diphthongs*, § 13, 3, b.

**11.** On η arising by contraction, see § 14, 7.

**12.** On η arising by compensative lengthening, see § 15.

## 5.

### o.

Cyprian ο answers regularly to primitive Greek ο and to ο of the other dialects; *e.g.* δάλτον Coll. 60, 26; ὅτε 60, 1; τόδε 102; δοϝέναι 60, 5, 15; ἐπαγομενᾶν 59, 2.

**1.** ὀνέθηκε Coll. 72, 1; 74, 2; 75, 2; 120, 4 corresponds

to the vulgar *ἀνέθηκε*. Meister's conjecture of *ὀ(μ)βά[ντι]* (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644) is not at all certain.

The origin of this monosyllabic form (frequent also in Lesbian, *e.g.* *ὀντέθην* Coll. 311, 8, 34; *ὀνθέντα* 311, 39, and in Thessalian, *e.g.* *ὀνγραφεῖ* Coll. 361, A, 11; B, 24; *ὀνγράψειν* 345, 21) is not clear. Whether *ἀν-ά*, *ἐν*, *ὀν-* represent three originally different forms of the same root (*i.e.* weak, strong, and ablaut), *ὀν-* finding its correspondent in German *an*, and *ἄν* being for *ϝην* (*cf.* Avestan *an-a*, for *ϝη-α ?*) is a question too difficult and complicated to be entered into here. One thing, however, seems certain, that unless *ἄν* and *ὀν-* do stand to each other in the relation suggested, they are not etymologically connected, but originally different words, like *μετά*, *πεδά*; *σύν*, *ξύν*.

As to the use of *ἄν* and *ὀν-*, Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 55) thinks that *ὄν-* was the form originally employed before consonants, *ἄν* before vowels, and that *ὀν-* occurs before vowels, as in Thessalian and Cyprian, by a subsequent extension of its proper use. But this view lacks sufficient foundation. It is based upon too slender evidence, drawn from the Lesbian, which certainly admits of other interpretation (*cf.* Meister, *Griechische Dialekte*, I., p. 50).

Beside the above-quoted Cyprian forms with *ὀν-* we find also *ἀνέθηκε* Coll. 17, 2; 76, 1; in the second instance in an inscription from the same locality as 72; 74; 75, which all have *ὀνέθηκε*; also *ἀνε-*, *i.e.* *ἀνέθηκε*, in one of the fragments published by Sayce in *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1884, No. 21, where Sayce erroneously takes *ἀνε-* as *ἆνε*, comparing Homeric *ἦνον ὁδόν* γ 496. (*Cf.* Voigt, *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 69.)

On *ὐνέθηκε*, Coll. 45, 3, for *ὀνέθηκε*, see below, § 9, 4.

**2.** The **ο** for **υ** in *ἰθονίκη*, Deecke's earlier reading of Coll. 41, disappears with the changed reading of that inscription (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317).

**3.** *Ἀμό(ν)τα*, Coll. 147, if correct, would speak for the similarity of **ο** and **υ** in this dialect, especially before nasals. *Cf.* below, on *ὐνέθηκε*, § 9, 4.

### 6.

ω.

Except when arising from contraction or compensative lengthening, ω corresponds regularly to primitive Greek ω and ω of the other dialects, *e.g.* εὐχωλᾶς COLL. 59, 3; δώκοι 60, 16; ἄνωγον 60, 2.

1. On ω for ωι (*i.e.* ῳ) in final syllables, see § 13, 3, c.
2. On ω arising by contraction, see § 14, 5, 13.

### 7.

ι.

Cyprian ι corresponds in general to primitive Greek ι and to ι of the other dialects; *e.g.* μισθῶν COLL. 60, 4; δεξίωι 37, 2; ἠμί 20, 1, *et pass.*

1. In a number of words ι has been changed from an original ε, *viz.* ἐπιό(ν)τα COLL. 60, 9, 19, 22; ϝέπιϳα (Ion. ἔπεα) 60, 26; θιῶι 37, 2; 61; 75, 2; θιόν 60, 27; ἰό(ν)τα 60, 23; ἴωσι 60, 31; τέρχνιϳα 60, 9, 18, 22; ἀτελίϳα 60, 23; κατέθιϳαν 60, 27; θιῶι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

It will be seen that the phenomenon is confined to those cases where the ε was followed by α, ο, or ω; so also in Bœotian and Doric (*cf.* Bœotian θιός COLL. 425, *et pass.*; ἀνέθιαν 414, 1; Heraclean ἀδικίων I, 138). The ϳ in the Cyprian forms κατέθιϳαν, ϝέπιϳα, ἀτελίϳα, τέρχνιϳα has been developed after the change of ε to ι; see below, § 18, 1. *Cf.* Pamphylian ἀ(ν)δριϳῶνα for ἀνδρεῶνα COLL. 1267, 8.

Forms which retain the ε before α, ο, ω are about as frequent as those which change it to ι, *viz.* Ἐτεοδάμα COLL. 135; Θεάνωρ 126, 1; θεῶ 2, 1; 3, 1; 15, 1; 16; θεῶι 27, 1; 40, 2; θεοῖς 68, 2; θεῶι 68, 3; 68, 4; 72, 2; θεῶ 74. 1; 78; Θεοτίμων 42; Θεοκλέος 126, 1; Τιμοκλέϝεος 36; 64; Τιμοκλέος 35; Θεοδώρων 42; Στασικράτεος 18, 2; Τιμοκρέτεος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ii.; *ibid.* viii.; Φιλοκρέτεος *ibid.* vii.; Εὐϝά(ν)θεος COLL. 162; Στασικρέτεος *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 68.

The change from ε to ι is confined almost exclusively to the two inscriptions Coll. 60, 61, both from Idalion. Outside of these it is found only three times, always in *θεός*, *viz.* *θιῶι* Coll. 37, 2; *θι[ῶι]* 75, 2; *θιῶι* *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323. Of these the first is from Palaipaphos, the second from Athienu; the last from Tamassus. Spitzer's statement therefore (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 16) that every ε before α or ο becomes ι in Cyprian, was evidently a conclusion drawn from the Idalian Bronze Tablet (Coll. 60) alone, and needs revision accordingly.

On *ἀτελήν* Coll. 60, 10 (acc. sing. from *ἀτελής*, where we should expect *ἀτελία* for *ἀτελέα*; *cf.* acc. plu. *ἀτελία* in line 23) see below, under *Contraction*, § 14, 6, and *Declension*, § 29, 8.

2. Another peculiarity is the preposition *ἰν* for *ἐν*. This occurs always in the form *ἰ(ν)* (see § 23, 2), *viz.* in Coll. 17, 2; 27, 2; 28; 31, 4; 37, 3; 59, 4; 60, 1, 3, 8, 9, 17, 20, 31; 72, 2 (twice, once with the dative and once with the accusative); probably also in the compound *ἰναλαλισμένα* 60, 26; very questionable is *ἰνιπά* 126, 3.

The closely related Arcadian dialect also has the same peculiarity, *e.g.* *ἰν* Coll. 1222, 2, 4, 20, 37, *et pass.*; the compounds *ἴγγυος* (*ἔγγυος*) 1222, 36; *ἰγκεχηρήκοι* (Att. *ἐγκεχειρήκοι*) 1222, 12; *ἰμφαῖνεν* (Att. *ἐμφαίνειν*) 1222, 24. The Arcadian also has *ἐν* several times, *e.g.* *ἐν* Ὀλυνπίαι Coll. 1183; *ἐν ἰράναι* 1235, 5, *et pass.*; but only before a vowel.

It is an ingenious theory of Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 14) that *ἰν* developed in Arcadian from *ἐν* before initial consonants, and he adduces analogies for this change from other languages, Old German and Latin; *e.g.* Lat. *tingo* for **tengo* (*cf.* *τέγγω*), *quīnque* (*i.e.* **pinque*) for **penque* (*cf.* *πέντε*), though it must be confessed that such words as *ventus*, *offendimentum* (Idg. *bhendh-*) furnish puzzling exceptions.

The fact that *ἐν* has survived in Arcadian is sufficient evidence that *ἰν* developed in that dialect only under certain conditions (otherwise *ἐν* would have disappeared altogether), and Spitzer's theory that this was before consonants is highly

probable. According to him the old formula ἐν πολέμοι καὶ ἐν ἰράναι (Coll. 1233, 5) represents the proper use of ἐν and ἰν respectively in Arcadian. (*Cf.* the similar relation of ἐς and εἰς in Attic, the former of which was *originally* used before an initial consonant, the latter before an initial vowel.) At the same time, Arcadian ἰν has already begun to encroach upon the legitimate territory of ἐν; *e.g.* ἰν ἀμέραις Coll. 1222, 4; ἰναγόντω 1222, 19.

In Cyprian, ἰ(ν), when used alone as a preposition, occurs only before initial consonants, never before a vowel, rejecting ἰν Ἀμύ(ν)τω, Coll. 41, in view of Deecke, *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317. In composition we have probably one instance of ἰν- before a vowel, *viz.* ἰναλαλισμένα Coll. 60, 26. ἰνιπά Coll. 126, 3, is too doubtful to admit. Deecke now (*Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 319) reads *ta·i·ne·ta·li·o·i·*, *i.e.* τᾶ ἰν Ἠδαλίωι, in Coll. 62, in place of his previous reading *ta·i·*|*e·ta·li·o·i·*, *i.e.* τᾶι Ἠδαλιοῖ (locative). This would give an instance of ἰν before a vowel. But the character which Deecke now wishes to take as *ne·*, while perhaps not a perfect *e·*, is certainly entirely different from the ordinary character for *ne·*, as seen not only in Idalian inscriptions, but others as well, and the mark after *ta·i·* as given in Schmidt (*Sammlung Kyprischer Inschriften in Epichorischer Schrift*, vii., 2) which Deecke wishes to join with the character in question bears every evidence of being a divisor. I can hardly believe therefore that Deecke is right in this new reading, whatever may be the difficulties of the old one.

The form ἐν has not as yet been brought to light in any Cyprian inscription, but, under the circumstances, this must not be regarded as conclusive evidence that it did not exist side by side with ἰν just as in Arcadian. The only place in which ἐν might fairly be expected to occur would be before an initial vowel (assuming Spitzer's theory to be correct), and but a single instance (itself not perfectly certain) of this sort can be cited (*viz.* ἰναλαλισμένα Coll. 60, 26), which of course so far as it goes contradicts Spitzer's theory when applied to the Cyprian.

Hall's latest reading of COLL. 76 (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 223), which he has again examined in the Cesnola collection in New York since the appearance of Collitz's *Sammlung*, is *τὰν ϝεικόνα τά(ν)δε 'ν 'Από[λ(λ)ωνα]*, — *i.e.* 'to Apollo,' in which he takes *'ν* for *ἰν* with aphæresis of the *ἰ* (*cf. οἶ* (*'ν*) for *οἶ ἰ(ν)* COLL. 60, 31). His reading, if correct, would, in view of the preceding *τά(ν)δε*, indicate that *ε* had disappeared rather than *ι*, and might be taken as furnishing some slight evidence of the existence of *ἐν*; but in view of the incompleteness of the inscription and the possibilities of combination, Hall's reading cannot be considered safe enough to base conclusions upon. Yet it is quite possible that the form *ἐν* may have existed in Cyprian and may yet be brought to light. At all events, until instances of *ἰν* before vowels are discovered, we have no right to declare that *ἰν* had driven *ἐν* out of use in Cyprian; any more than we should be justified in claiming the same for the Arcadian dialect on the basis of Arcadian *ἰν ἀμέραις* COLL. 1222, 4, and *ἰναγόντω* 1222, 19, assuming that instances of *ἐν* before vowels in Arcadian had not yet been found. Arcadian *ἰν ἀμέραις* and *ἰναγόντω* when viewed in the light of *ἐν 'Αρκαδίαι* COLL. 1200, 3; *ἐν ἰράναι* 1233, 5; *ἐν 'Ολυνπίαι* 1183, 6; *ἐν ἀγῶσι* 1231, are seen to be encroachments of *ἰν* upon the domain of *ἐν*. Cyprian *ἰναλαλισμένα* is perhaps most safely explained in the same way.

Further light is thrown upon the question by the Cyprian forms *μέν* COLL. 71 (*μὲν ἔστασαν*) and *μί* COLL. 1, 1; 2, 2 (*μὶ κατέθηκε*). These forms *μέν* and *μί* are unquestionably for *μέ*, the acc. sing. of the first personal pronoun. On the origin of *μέν* from *μέ*, see § 31, 1. *μί* is certainly to be considered as *μί(ν)* (see § 31, 2), and as developed from *μέν* before a consonant, just as *ἰν* from *ἐν*. Only the initial vowel of *ἔστασαν* in COLL. 71 has preserved to us the form *μέν*. Can we doubt that, if we had preserved to us instances of the preposition (*ἐν, ἰν*) before initial vowels, it would appear as *ἐν*?

On Hall's reading of *μί(ν)* in COLL. 45, 1, before an initial vowel and Voigt's reading of *μίν* in 45, 4, also before an initial vowel, see § 23, 4; 9, 4.

3. On the ι of the *κατέθισαν* (= Att. *κατέθεσαν*) Coll. 20, 2, see below, under *Conjugation*, § 32, 5.

## 8.

### ῑ.

Where it occurs, ῑ corresponds to primitive Greek ῑ and to ῑ of the other dialects; *e.g.* *Δαμονίκω* Coll. 151; 179; *Ἐχετίμων* 38, 2; *Θεοτίμων* 42; *ἶνις* *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 316; *πῖθι* Coll. 135.

1. *ἰρῶνι* Coll. 60, 8; 31, if correct and to be connected with *ἱερός* in the sense of 'consecrated district,' probably had ῑ, which must be explained in the same way as the perplexing Homeric *ἰρός*, Lesbian *ἶρος*. Osthoff (*Morphologische Untersuchungen*, iv., p. 151) assumes **ἰσ-ρός* for the original form, as otherwise it is impossible to account for the ῑ in Lesbian; a primitive **ἴσρός* would have given **ἴρρος* in that dialect.

Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv., p. 42) reads the ι with the preceding *τῶ*, *i.e.* *τῶι ῥωνί*, or according to his principles *τοῖ ῥωνί* (*τοῖ* locative; see below, § 27, 3) '*in the plain.*'

2. *φῑδωλός* is Deecke's reading in Coll. 126, 3 for *φειδωλός*. But the change of primitive ει to ῑ in Cyprian is altogether improbable, since ει whether original or of secondary origin is elsewhere retained; *e.g.* *πείσει* Coll. 60, 12, 25; *ῥέτει* 59, 1; 60, 1; *ἔτει* 76, 1; *αἰϝεί* 60, 31; *Ἀπείλων* *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323. Moreover, one or two of the characters of which the word consists are quite uncertain.

## 9.

### ῠ.

Cyprian ῠ corresponds in general to primitive Greek ῠ and to ῠ of the other dialects; *e.g.* *ἐπέτυχε* Coll. 59, 4; *κᾶρυξ* 65, 1; *σύν* 60, 28; *ἀργύρω* 60, 6, *et pass.*

1. *δυϝάνοι* (for *δυ-άν-οι*, with parasitic *ϝ*, see § 17, 2) Coll. 60, 6 seems to be from the root *δυ-* 'give,' seen in Lat. *du-im*,

*du-int*, and not to be confounded with δω-, δο-. *Cf.* Deecke-Siegismund in Curtius' *Studien*, vii., p. 248.

**2.** Final ο in Cyprian when preceded by a consonant invariably changed to ν. The instances are *ἀπύ* Coll. 60, 8, 17; *γένοιτυ* 60, 29; *ἐϝρητάσατυ* 60, 14; *εὐϝρητάσατυ* 60, 4; *ὡρίσετυ* 126, 1. So in Arcadian; *e.g. ἀπύ* Coll. 1222, 4; *ἄλλυ* 1222, 40. The Thessalian and Lesbian also have *ἀπύ*, and the Pamphylian shows the change of ο to ν not only in case of final ο, but also elsewhere; *e.g. ἐβωλάσετυ* Coll. 1267, 8; *ϝοικύπολις* 1267, 14; *βωλήμενυς* 1267, 13.

Arcadian *κατύ* (for *κατά*) Coll. 1222, 11, 29, has not yet been found in Cyprian. Nor does *κατά* itself occur.

**3.** So also in -ᾱο the ending of the gen. sing. of masculine -ᾱ- stems, ο usually changes to ν, preparatory to undergoing contraction to -αυ, *e.g.* Θεμίαυ Coll. 66; Μαράκαυ 29; but we find ᾱο- in Κυπραγόρᾱο Coll. 79 and Δαϳατίσᾱο 58. On these see below, § 14, 4.

**4.** *ὐνέθηκε* is read by Deecke, Coll. 45, 3, as a local variation of *ὀνέθηκε*, *i.e. ἀνέθηκε*; see above, § 5, 1. The only difficulty with this reading is that the character for *u* · (Λ) has a superfluous horizontal line drawn over its top. This has led Voigt (*Quaestiones de Titulis Cypriis*, p. 282, and later in *Bezz. Beitr.*, ix., p. 166) to conjecture an error of the stone-cutter, whereby the horizontal line was made over, instead of under, the rest of the character. With that change we should get the regular syllabic sign for *mi* ·. This combined with the other characters gives *μὶν ἔθηκε*, in which Voigt takes *μίν* as the equivalent of *μέ*. But 1) it seems more natural to regard the horizontal line above the *u* · as an accidental scratch than as a mistake of the engraver.

2) *μιν* for *μεν*, *i.e.* με, before an initial vowel, is not admissible (see above, § 7, 2, *ad fin.*).

3) *ἔθηκε* is not the proper word for a dedicatory inscription, as this evidently is. The regular word is *ὀνέθηκε* or *ἀνέθηκε*, which occurs frequently (see above, § 5, 1).

4) Voigt's objection to the form of the word (*ὐν-* for *ὀν-*) is not well founded, and is the result of a false conception of

the relation of *ὀν-* and *ἀν-*. Voigt takes *ὀν-* as derived from *ἀν-* by some phonetic process, and refuses to believe that *ἀν-* after becoming *ὀν-* could still further progress to *ὐν-*. *ὀν-*, however, must be taken as an independent form (see above, § 5, 1), and that it should become *ὐν-*, in a dialect where the relations of ο and υ are confessedly very close, is not to be regarded as surprising.

That these relations were close is made evident not only by the regular change of final -ο to -υ, as noted above, but also by Ἀμό(ν)τα Coll. 147, for Ἀμύ(ν)τα (if correct; see § 5, 3), and *ὐνέθηκε* for *ὀνέθηκε*. *Cf.* the same phenomenon in Bœotian Ἀμόντας (for Ἀμύντας) Coll. 603; Νιυμείνιος (for Νιομείνιος) Coll. 485, 24. It is noteworthy that in Bœotian too the phenomenon seems to occur chiefly before nasals.

5. Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 17, note) cites Cyprian *δυϝάνοι* Coll. 60, 6 as illustrating the change of ο to υ in the interior of a word. But *δοϝέναι* in the same inscription, lines 5, 15, certainly does not speak for this change, nor do other words in the dialect; so that the reference of the word to root δυ-, as above (1), is undoubtedly correct.

## 10.

### ῡ.

We find ῡ in λύ̄ση (*i.e.* λύσῃ) Coll. 60, 29; λῦσαι 60, 28; σῡλήση (*i.e.* σῡλήσῃ) 126, 2, where it corresponds to ῡ of the other dialects, and presents no peculiarities.

## Diphthongs.

## 11.

### αι.

1. Primitive Greek αι appears in *αἰϝεί* Coll. 60, 31; *δοϝέναι* (Att. *δοῦναι*, for *δο(ϝ)έναι*) 60, 5, 15; *ἰ̓ᾶσθαι* 60, 3.

2. *ὕϝαις*, the accepted reading in Coll. 60, 10, is taken by Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv., p. 54) as from the preposition *ὑ* (= *ἐπί*; see below, § 33, 5) with the adverbial ending -αις

appended. On the parasitic ϝ see § 17, 2. This ending -αις, which appears nowhere else in Greek, Ahrens identifies with the Skrt. termination *-āis* as seen in *uccāís*, *çánāis*. But these are instrumentals from *-o-* stems (see Whitney, *Indische Grammatik*, § 1112), and are formally identical with the so-called dat. plu. of -ο- stems in -οις (for *-ωις, Idg. *-ōis*; as *Ζεύς* for *Ζηύς*; *ναῦς* for *νᾱ̃ύς*, *etc.*; Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 298). On a more probable explanation of *ὕϝαις*, see below, § 33, 5.

3. Interesting is *αἴλων*, Coll. 60, 14, = Att. *ἄλλων*. This is by epenthesis for a primitive **ἄλιος* (Lat. *alius*), whence **αἴλιος*, *αἶλος*. *Cf.* the Hesychian gloss *αἰλότροπον · ἀλλοιότροπον* and the recently discovered Cyprian form *Ἀπείλων* (for **Ἀπέλιων*) in the inscription communicated by Deecke in the *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

4. ᾰι has also been assumed by Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 26) in preference to -αι (*i.e.* -ᾳ) as the ending of such singular forms as *μάχαι*, *τύχαι*, *Γολγίαι*, *etc.* Spitzer first (*ibid.*, p. 25) attempts to demonstrate for the Arcadian that the forms in -αι in that dialect have the α short and not long (-ᾰι not -ᾱι). He is convinced that -ᾱι could not have remained unchanged in Arcadian, but would have lost the iota and so have appeared as -ᾱ. His grounds for this are that final -ηι (*i.e.* -ῃ) loses its iota in Arcadian and appears as -η; *e.g.* *τυγχάνη*, Coll. 1222, 14, for *τυγχάνῃ*. He also adduces Arcadian *Ἀγεμώ*, which he takes as for *Ἀγεμώι*, Coll. 1185. But this last is by no means certain.

Spitzer's reasoning, however, is not conclusive, since final ᾱι, ηι, ωι do not necessarily all develop in the same way; and in fact even in one and the same dialect one and the same diphthong sometimes retains the ι and sometimes drops it; *e.g.* Ionic *τῆ βουλῆ* (for *τῇ βουλῇ*) Erythrae, 394 B.C.; *δημοσίη*, Mylasa, 355 B.C.; but *τῇ φυγῇ*, Samos, 322 B.C., Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] 510, 6. Hence it is quite possible that the Arcadian might have retained final -ᾱι, and that such forms as *Τεγέαι* Coll. 1222, 34; *Ἀρκαδίαι* 1200, 3; *Ὀλυνπίαι* 1183, 6; *ζαμίαι* 1222, 18, should be considered as ending in -ᾱι, so far as any phonetic necessity is concerned. The only reason

for not taking them as ending in -ᾱι is found in the corresponding forms from -ο- stems; *e.g.* ἔργοι Coll. 1222, 49; ἡμίσσοι 1222, 25. These latter must necessarily be regarded as locatives (to explain them as datives, with -οι shortened from -ωι is against all principles of Greek phonology), and so after the same analogy the forms from -ᾱ- stems are most naturally taken as locative, and as ending in -ᾰι. A confirmation of this view is found in the similar Bœotian forms from -ο- and -α- stems; *e.g.* δάμυ (*i.e.* δάμοι) Coll. 380, 3; ταμίη (*i.e.* ταμίᾰι) Coll. 385, 5.

The above considerations, therefore, are not intended to show the incorrectness of Spitzer's conclusion in regard to the Arcadian forms in -ᾰι, but simply the unsafeness of his method in reaching that conclusion. The same theory (*viz.* that -ᾱι cannot stand in Arcadian) applied to the closely related Cyprian dialect, as Spitzer (*ibid.*, p. 26) does apply it, leads to a false conclusion. Let us first look at the facts. We find in Cyprian the following dative forms: —

1) forms in -αι (whether -ᾱι or -αι is to be determined).

τύχαι ἀζαθâι Coll. 37, 3; 59, 4; Ἀλα(μ)πριϳάται 60, 8; ἀρούραι 60, 20; Ἀφροδίται 1, 3; Γολγίαι 61; ζâι 60, 8, 17, 24; Μαλανίϳαι 60, 17; μάχαι 60, 3; Παφίαι 1, 3; πεδίϳαι 60, 18; Περσεύται 45, 3; τâι 1, 2; 40, 2; 60, 3, 6, 8 (twice), 17 (twice), 18, 24; 61 (twice); 62, 1; τύχαι 17, 2; 27, 2; 28; 31, 4; 33, 2; 37, 3; 72, 2; *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323; 1887, No. 12, col. 380; Ϝλάται Coll. 27, 1; 28; 31, 4; 32, 2; Ἀθάναι 17, 2; Ἀλασιώται *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380; Ἀρισταγόραι *ibid.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644; δοϳâι, Deecke's earlier reading in Coll. 41, is now no longer maintained by him. (See *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317.)

2) forms in -ᾱ.

Ἀθάνα Coll. 62; τύχα 74, 3; 120, 4; τâ 17, 2; 60, 8, 17; 62, 1; τâ Παφία, the correct reading of Coll. 9, according to Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 212). εὐχωλâ 27, 2 is best taken as nominative; Ἐτεοδάμα Coll. 135, which Deecke (*ad loc.*) says may be taken as either dat. or gen. (with omitted -ς; see § 20, 1) is best taken as vocative; ὁσέϳα,

Deecke's earlier reading in COLL. 41 is no longer maintained by him; see *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317.

Spitzer's conclusion with regard to the above forms (whether he had them all before him is doubtful) is this. Those in -αι, while used as datives, he considers may be morphologically either locative or dative formations. Both these formations, he holds, were in case of -ᾱ- stems originally the same, the locative -ᾱι arising from primitive ᾱ+ι, the dative -ᾱι from ᾱ+αι. Either of these, according to Spitzer, must develop to -ᾱ in Arcadian or Cyprian. The forms in -αι on the other hand he takes as locatives and as ending in -ᾰι. This -ᾰι he regards not as a primitive locative formation, but as developed secondarily from the primitive locative termination -ᾱι (for ᾱ+ι), after the analogy of the locatives in -οι from -ο- stems (*e.g.* *οἴκοι*). This may be expressed by the proportion:

$$οἴκῳ : οἴκοι :: τύχᾳ : τύχᾰι.$$

Against Spitzer's theory must be urged

1) There is no evidence that the -ᾱ- stems ever formed a locative in ᾱ+ι, which might give -ᾱι. (*Cf.* Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 351.) Hence the locatives in -ᾰι from -ᾱ- stems are not the successors of an earlier locative formation in -ᾱι, but are best explained as entirely new formations. This being the case, the Cyprian forms in -ᾱ- could originate only from a dative -ᾱι, not from a locative -ᾱι. They are therefore datives.

2) If we view the forms in -αι as locatives (*i.e.* as ending in ᾰι), we shall have the anomaly of the locative taking on the function of the dative, and being used in precisely the same phrases and formulas, along with the continued use of the dative itself. The improbability of this fact is sufficiently great. Wherever one inflectional form takes on the function of another, it is to the exclusion of the latter, at least in the same function. Thus Arcadian *ἔργοι*, locative used as dative, has supplanted *ἔργῳ*; *ζαμίᾰι* similarly has supplanted *ζαμίᾱι*. So also Attic *τείχη*, dual (borrowed from plu.), has taken its

place in the dual to the exclusion of the regular formation τείχει (for τείχεε); *cf.* Att ζεύγει CIA. II., 652, B, 26 (Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inscriften*,[1] p. 61). But according to Spitzer's view, in such an inscription as τᾶ Ἀθάναι COLL. 17, 2 we should have a dative article τᾶ limiting a locative noun. (*Cf.* also 60, 8, 17 ἀπὺ τᾶι ζᾶι τᾶι βασιλῆϝος τᾶ ἰ(ν) τῶ ἰρῶνι, where similarly τᾶ, dative, would stand in apposition with a locative τᾶι ζᾶι.)

3) The adverb παι (*cf.* Doric πᾳ, Attic πῃ) COLL. 60, 4, 12; 71, can only be for πᾶι, and shows clearly that final -ᾶι in Cyprian did not necessarily lose its ι, and that other forms with -ᾶι may therefore exist in Cyprian.

The forms in -αι are therefore to be considered as datives, hence as ending in -ᾶι, while those in -ᾱ are also datives, with the -ᾱ developed from -ᾶι, as frequent in many dialects. Ahrens assumes a locative in -ᾶι, and a dative in -ᾱ and -ᾶι. See below under *Inflections*, § 25, 5.

5. Δι̯αίθεμι(ς) COLL. 74, 1 (*cf.* Διϝείθεμις 60, 21) is obscure in its form and probably incorrect, as the inscription seems to be carelessly written.

## 12.

### ει.

Cyprian ει corresponds regularly to primitive Greek ει and to ει of the other dialects in αἰϝεί COLL. 60, 31; ϝεικόνα 76, 2; πείσει (Att.[1] τείσει) 60, 12, 25.

1. ει by epenthesis appears in the form Ἀπείλων in the bilingual inscription communicated by Deecke in the *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323. The original formation *Ἀπέλι̯ων, became first *Ἀπείλι̯ων and thence Ἀπείλων. *Cf.* Pamphylian Ἀπέλ(λ)ωνα (for *Ἀπέλι̯ωνα) COLL. 1267, 30; Syracusan Ἀπέλ(λ)ωνι Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 509, and the Arcadian proper name Ἀπελλίων COLL. 1190, all of which represent the same form of the

[1] Often incorrectly written τίσω; but τει- is the regular form of the root for the future and is assured by Attic inscriptions of the best period. See Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*,[1] p. 24, 88.

root syllable, *viz.* πελ-. The ordinary Cyprian form Ἀπόλ-(λ)ων represents the ablaut of the same root, while Thessalian Ἄπλουν (ου = ω), seen in Ἄπλουνι COLL. 368; 372; Ἄπλουνος 345, 22, represents the weak form. *Cf.* the similar "*Abstufung*" in the name Ποσειδών, Laconian Ποοιδᾶνι (*i.e.* Ποσοιδᾶνι) Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 83; Corinthian Ποτιδάν *ibid.*, 20.

2. The ει of the form ἐϝείσης COLL. 68, 2 cannot be justified. Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 79) takes this as the equivalent of the Homeric ἐΐση (*cf.* νέες ἑῖσαι, *i.e.* *ἐϝῖσαι). But assuming this to be correct the change of ῑ to ει or the opposite (see on φῑδωλός, § 8, 2) remains to be proved for the Cyprian dialect. All the existing evidence shows that no such change took place. Moreover, the primitive form of the Homeric word was ϝίσϝος, as shown by the recently discovered Gortynian inscription. ϝισϝόμοιρον X., 53; ϝίσϝον Frag. B, 2. Hence the probable reading of the Homeric text is ἐ-ῖσσαι (for *ἐ-ϝίσσαι; the ε prothetic). It is clear that a form ἐ-ϝισϝ- could not give Cyprian ἐ-ϝεισ-. The Ionic η too, of the termination, discredits the word, and the phrase, ποτ' (for ποτί, *i.e.* πρός) ἐϝείσης is not elsewhere found. On the general uncertainty of the context, see p. 2.

3. The ει in the first member of Διϝείθεμις COLL. 60, 21, where some claim an old dative, is difficult of explanation. Attic Διειτρέφης CIA. I., 447, III., 53, *et pass.* is probably kindred.

4. On ει arising by contraction, see § 14, 9.

## 13.

### ευ, οι; ᾱι, ηι, ωι; αυ.

1. In one or two instances ευ has developed from ε before ϝ, *viz.* in εὐϝρητάσατυ (for ἐϝρητάσατυ) COLL. 60, 3, and κενευϝόν (for κενεϝόν; *cf.* Homeric κενεός) 20, 2. This points clearly to ϝ as a bilabial and not a labio-dental spirant in Cyprian, as does also the development of ϝ between ευ and a following vowel (see below, § 17, 2); though that it points to

that pronunciation of ϝ for all Greek dialects, as Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 230) seems to conclude, cannot be admitted. There may have been a labio-dental as well as a bilabial ϝ in Greek, just as in Germany in case of *w*.

The υ which was doubtless heard in the spoken language between every ε and a succeeding ϝ is not expressed in inscriptions except in the instances above cited. Elsewhere we find ἐϝρητάσατυ COLL. 60, 14; ἔϝρεξα 71; Ἐτεϝά(ν)δρω 46; 47; κατεϝόρκων 60, 1; νεροστάτας 59, 2; Νικοκλέϝης 40, 1.

The same development of ο to ου before ϝ probably existed, but existing inscriptions show no evidence of any attempt to indicate this refinement of pronunciation. *Cf.* δοϝέναι COLL. 60, 5, 15; Ἀριστοκόϝων (questioned by Hall, *Four. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216) 45, 1.

**2.** οι has also been assumed by Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 24, Note) as the termination of those forms from -ο- stems which Deecke transcribes as -ωι (*i.e.* -ῳ, dative). Spitzer takes these as locatives, holding that -ωι could not remain unchanged in either Arcadian or Cyprian, but must always become -ω. That -ωι did frequently lose its ι in Cyprian is beyond question. This is shown clearly by the frequent dative forms in -ω (for the instances see below, 3, c). But it is not true that -ωι always lost its ι any more than did -āι (see above, § 11, 4); -āι and -ωι seem both of them to be passing through a sort of transition period in the dialect of our Cyprian inscriptions.

Moreover if, with Spitzer, we transcribe Cyprian *-o·i·* by -οι (*i.e.* locative), we shall be forced to admit a serious inconsistency in such phrases as τοῖ θεῶ COLL. 74, 1 and τοῖ θεοῖ τῶ Ϝλάται 27, 1, where we should have a dative article limiting a locative noun. There is therefore not only no phonetic necessity for admitting -οι instead of -ωι, but to do so would lead to an absurdity. The view of Ahrens, who claims a locative in -οι and also a dative in -ωι and -ω, involves no phonetic considerations and will be considered below under *Inflections*, § 26, 3.

**3.** The diphthongs -ᾱι, -ηι, -ωι (*i.e.* -ᾳ, -ῃ, -ῳ) often lose their ι and appear as -ᾱ, -η, -ω.

a) The examples of -ᾱ for -ᾱι have already been given above (see § 11, 4, 2). So far as can be seen they reveal no law. Yet as we find forms in -ᾱ and -ᾱι side by side in the same inscription, it is natural to assume a phonetic origin for the shorter forms. These may have originated before initial vowels, while -ᾱι was retained before consonants, though the evidence is not sufficient to make this at all certain.

b) Final η stands regularly in the 3d sing. of the subjunctive for -ηι, *viz.* in λύση Coll. 60, 29; συλήση 126, 2; ἐξ ὀρύξη 60, 12, 24, 25. *Cf.* Arcadian τυγχάνη Coll. 1222, 14; ἔχη 1222, 26; Cretan καταλύη Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] 44, 69. Deecke's Ἄδη Coll. 126, 2, which he takes for Ἄιδηι, is not certain (see § 4, 1). Final ηι is nowhere retained in Cyprian, so that Deecke's suggestion of Ϝεργηι as the reading of Coll. 124, is un-Cyprian, apart from the general uncertainty as to the genuineness of the inscription; see p. 3.

It is noteworthy that while we have frequent instances of -ᾱι and -ωι in Cyprian, -ηι nowhere occurs, but always -η instead. The Cyprian accordingly exhibits the same tendency as other dialects, in which -ηι is the first of the improper diphthongs to lose its ι. *Cf.* in the Therean inscription (Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] 148), πάθη II., 28; ἢ vi., 20; εἴπη viii., 9; but τῶι κοινῶι ii., 9; Ἀνδραγόραι iii., 2. This is physiologically natural, as the ι being more closely related in sound to η than to ω and ᾱ, would more easily be absorbed by a preceding η than by either of the other two vowels. (*Cf.* Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik*, I., p. 121.)

c) -ωι (*i.e.* -ῳ) loses the ι and appears as -ω in the following instances: τῶι θεῶ τῶ Ἀπόλλωνι Coll. 74, 1; τῶι θεῶι τῶ Ϝλάται 27, 1; τῶ Ϝλάται 28; Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι τῶ Ϝλάται 31, 4; τ'Ὠσίρι (*i.e.* τῶ Ὀσίρι) 45, 1; τῶ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι τῶ Ἀμύκλωι 59, 3; τῶ ἱρῶνι τῶι Ἀλλα(μ)πριάται 60, 8; τῶ ἱρῶνι τῶι Ἡδαλιῆϊ 60, 31; τῶ Ὀσίρι 72, 1; τῶι θεῶι τῶ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι 72, 2; τῶι θι[ῶι] τῶ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι 75, 3; τῶ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι τῶ Μαγιρίω 120, 2, 3; τῶ θιῶι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323;

'Αρισταγόραι τῶ 'Ονασιρσίκω *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, 1644. "Α(ι)δη(ι) μισαάτω Coll. 126, 2 and τῶ ἀ(ν)θρώπω 126, 3 are very doubtful.

An examination of the above instances almost tempts to the conclusion that -ω originated from -ωι before vowels. Rejecting the last two forms as uncertain, all the others accord with this inference, except τῶ θιῶι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323; τῶ Μαγιρίω Coll. 120, 3; θεῶ τῶ 74, 1. But forms in -ωι also occur quite numerously before vowels; *e.g.* τῶι 'Αλα(μ)πριήται Coll. 60, 8; τῶι ἔλει 60, 9; τῶ̓ι 'Ηδαλιῆι 60, 31; τῶι 'Απείλωνι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323, so that the existence of the law suggested cannot be established. The absence of such a law in the occurrence of -ᾱ and -ᾱι (see a, above) is also opposed to its existence here.

**4.** On αυ by contraction from -ᾱο, see § 14, 4.

## 14.

### *Contraction of Vowels.*

**1.** ᾰ+ε gives ᾱ in ἰ̓ᾶσθαι (for ἰ̓άεσθαι) Coll. 60, 3 and by crasis in τἀπί (for τὰ ἐπί) 37, 2.

**2.** ᾰ+ο. Αὐλάονος Coll. 63; δίμαον 69; Δαόφα 83 are all too uncertain to be considered here.

**3.** ᾰ+ω. 'Αβροθάωι Coll. 129, 130; 'Ανάω 97; τιμῶ 69 are all uncertain.

**4.** ᾱ+ο. Final -ᾱο in the gen. sing. of masc. -ᾱ- stems (*cf.* Homeric 'Ατρείδᾱο) contracts to -αυ as in Arcadian (*cf.* Arc. 'Απολλωνίδαυ Coll. 1231, B, 16), *viz.* in 'Αρισταγόραυ Coll. 28; 'Αριστήαυ 20, 1; Θεμίαυ 66; Μαράκαυ 29; Νασιώταυ 21, 2; 'Ονασαγόραυ 60, 1, 22; Στασίαυ 17, 1; Τιμαγόραυ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, viii.; 'Ονασαγόραυ *ibid.*, x.; Στασαγόραυ iv.; Πυνταγόραυ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 51, xv.; Τιμαγόραυ *ibid.*, xvii.

Κυπραγόρᾱο Coll. 79 and Δαϝατίσᾱο 58, however, remain uncontracted. Deecke on the latter regards the termination -αο as also diphthongal, which is perhaps correct. *Cf.* Ionic αὐτοῖς, ταῦτα, αὐτόν (for αὐτοῖς, *etc.*) Cauer, *Delectus*,[2] 510.

'Αμηνίjᾱ, Coll. 60, 18, gen. sing. from 'Αμηνίjας, 'Αριστίjᾱ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 52, xx., and Εὐϝαγόρω, 153, 154, gen. sing. of Εὐϝαγόρας (*cf.* 'Ονασαγόραυ above), are difficult of explanation and due perhaps to foreign influence. See below, under *Inflections*, § 25, 3.

**5.** ᾱ+ω contracts to ᾱ in the gen. pl. of -ᾱ- stems. The only example preserved is ἐπαγομενᾶν Coll. 59, 2. *Cf.* Arcadian ἐργωνᾶν Coll. 1222, 47.

**6.** ε+ᾰ does not contract in Cyprian, but in the Idalian Bronze Tablet (Coll. 60) ε becomes ι according to § 7, 1, always with the parasitic *j* (see § 18, 1), *viz.* in τέρχνιja, Coll. 60, 9, 18, 22; ϝέπιja 60, 26; ἀτελίja 60, 23; κατέθιjαν 60, 27. ἀτελῆν, acc. sing. from ἀτελής, Deecke's reading in Coll. 60, 10, is no exception to the above principle. This is not to be taken as a contracted form for ἀτελέα (*cf.* ἀτελίja 60, 23), *i.e.* ἀτελῆ, with added -ν, as in case of ἀ(ν)δριjά(ν)τα-ν Coll. 59, 2 (see § 29, 1), but is rather the same formation as is seen in Lesbian δαμοτέλην (from δαμοτέλης) Coll. 304, A, 44 (see under *Inflections*, § 29, 8). Hence the form is to be written ἀτελήν.

Instead of Deecke's ἤ κε (= εἴ κε) Coll. 60, 10, 23, Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 113, foot-note) suggests ἤ(ν) κε. (On (ν) see § 23, 2.) This ἤ(ν) he takes as the Cyprian contract form of ἐάν. We should thus have the same combination of κε and ἄν as in Homer; *e.g.* ὄφρ' ἀν μέν κεν Λ 187. But it is inadmissible to assume contraction of εα to η and is moreover unnecessary. Meyer's unwillingness to accept ἤ as an independent particle (related to but not identical with εἰ) is not well founded in view of the occurrence of ἤ in this sense in the Cretan inscription from Gortyna, *e.g.* iv., 31; v., 9.

Outside of the Bronze Tablet εᾰ remains unchanged, *viz.* in Θεάνωρ Coll. 126, 1; Νεα- 76.

**7.** ε+ε gives η in ἦχε (for *ἔεχε, *i.e.* *ἔ-σεχ-ε), Att. εἶχε, Coll. 60, 21. Whether the same contraction takes place in the infinitive of -ω- verbs is uncertain. Deecke in Coll. 60, 10, 22 writes ἔχην, *i.e.* for *ἔχε-εν, Att. ἔχειν. See below, under *Conjugation*, § 32, 11.

εὐζαϝεῖτε Coll. 56 which Deecke reads as contracted form for εὐζαϝέετε (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 148) cannot be regarded as a Cyprian form.

In the group -εεο- εε does not contract, but the group is simplified by aphæresis of the first ε. Instances of this are Θεοκλέος for Θεοκλέεος (*i.e.* Θεοκλέϝεος) Coll. 126, 1; Τιμοκλέος 35 (*cf.* Arcadian Ξενοκλέος for Ξενοκλέεος, Coll. 1246, B, 12; Χαρικλέος 1246, B, 4); σπέος, gen. sing. for *σπέεος (*i.e.* *σπέ-εσ-ος) 31, 2; 32, 2. Deecke reads σπέως here, assuming contraction of εο to ω, but εο does not elsewhere contract to ω in Cyprian (*cf.* Θεοκλέος, Τιμοκλέος; Στασικράτεος Coll. 18, 2, *etc.*), nor in the closely related Arcadian (see above). Hence the Cyprian form must be σπέος, even though the genitive thereby becomes identical with the nominative.

The Cyprian accordingly bears out the general principle assumed by Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 37), *viz.* that when of three successive vowels the last two are incapable of contraction, in the particular dialect where they occur, the first of the three disappears.

In the same connection Spitzer formulates another general principle intended to apply to all Greek dialects. It is this: When of three successive vowels the two latter are capable of contraction, they contract and no further contraction with the first vowel takes place. This principle I believe to be unsafe and to be contradicted by an undoubted illustration taken from the Arcadian itself, *viz.* δαμιοργός. This is generally incorrectly referred to a form δαμιοεργός. But the second member of the compound as a *nomen agentis* demands the ablaut of the root, -ϝοργ-; *cf.* κλοπ-ός 'thief'; σκοπ-ός 'spy'; πομπ-ός 'attendant' *etc.* See Meyer *Gr. Gr.*², § 9. The Homeric poems, it is true, exhibit δημιοεργός τ 383 *et pass.*; but this is to be regarded as of secondary origin by the side of *δαμιο-οργός. *Cf.* the similar relation existing between Att. πεντηκόντ-oρος 'fifty-oared galley' and Ionic πεντηκόντ-ερος, — root ἐρ- 'row'. So Attic inscriptions have τριακόντ-ερος by the side of the earlier τριακόντ-oρος. See

Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*[1], p. 10; *cf.* Meyer *Gr. Gr.*,[2] *l.c.*

No dialect has preserved any instance in inscriptions of the original formation. –ΟΡΓΟΣ in inscriptions written in the old alphabet, *e.g.* Coll. 1170, 2 (Elean); 1479, 15 (Locrian), if not actually for *-οργός* (as read by Bechtel in case of the latter inscription), may be taken as easily for the contraction of *-οοργός* as of *-οεργός*. So also Attic *δημιουργός* points no more clearly to *-οεργός* than *-οοργός*. The Messenian dialect has *δαμιοργός* Cauer *Delectus*,[2] 47, 119; so also the Achæan, cig. 1542; Megarian, Coll. 3094, 19; Pamphylian, 1261, 3.

In all these cases *δαμιοργός* is to be derived from the primitive form **δαμιο-οργός* by aphæresis of the first ο. In other words, we have the same law here as in the Cyprian forms *Θεοκλέος*, *Τιμοκλέος* mentioned above. The facts I believe authorize us to assume at least for the Arcadian and Cyprian the following law: When of three successive vowels the first and second or the second and third are repetitions of the same sound, one of the repeated vowels disappears. This law also shows evidences of its operation even to a wider extent than these two dialects; *e.g.* Cretan *Πριανσιές* for *-ιέες* cig. 2556, 30; Ionic *βορέω* for *βορέεω*; so also the infinitives of contract verbs in *-άω*, *-έω*, *-όω*, **τιμάεν* (whence *τιμᾶν*) for **τιμάεεν*; **φιλέεν* (whence *φιλεῖν*) for **φιλέεεν*; *μισθόεν* (whence *μισθοῦν*) for **μισθόεεν*.

The above explanation of *δαμιοργός* not only starts from the form demanded by the signification of the compound but explains its further development by a principle simple and natural and abundantly illustrated in Arcadian, Cyprian, and elsewhere. Spitzer's explanation (after Ahrens, *De Graecae Linguae Dialectis*, I., p. 234) refers the word to a primitive *δαμιο-εργός*, whence *δαμιωργός* by contraction; thence, by shortening of the ω, *δαμιοργός*. This shortening of a long vowel when followed by a liquid + consonant, though maintained by Brugmann (*Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik*, I., p. 463), does not seem as certain, by any means, as

the other instances of vowel-shortening adduced by Brugmann in the same connection, and is to be regarded as doubtful. Even if admitted for *στόρνυμι* (from **στώρ-νυ-μι*) and *βόλλομαι*, *i.e.* **βόλνομαι* (from **βώλ-νομαι*), it is by no means certain that it operated subsequently to the disappearance of *ϝ*, as must be assumed for *δαμιο-(ϝ)εργός*.

Thessalian λειτοργοῦντος (*i.e.* *-ῶντος*) *Mittheilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, vii., 346, which is explained by Prellwitz (*De dialecto Thessalica*, p. 43) by the shortening of ω (for οε) to ο, is not certain and probably incorrect. Lolling, in publishing the inscription, says: "Da der stein hoch eingemauert, musste ich auf sicherstellung der zweifelhaft und undeutlich bleibenden stellen verzichten"; so that confirmation of the form is needed. If correct, *λειτοργοῦντος* might be referred to the influence of *δαμιοργοῦντος*.

**8.** ε+η remains unchanged in Θεητονίκω Coll. 128.

**9.** ε+ι may be contracted in *ϝέτει* Coll. 60, 1; 59, 1; *ἔλει* 60, 9; *ἔτει* 76, 1, though the character of the Cyprian syllabary makes it impossible to determine whether the vowels were contracted or spoken separately.

**10.** ε+ο in the Bronze Tablet becomes ιο in accordance with § 7, 1; *viz.* in *ἐπιό(ν)τα* (for *ἐπεό(ν)τα*) Coll. 60, 9, 19, 22; *ἰό(ν)τα* 60, 23.

Elsewhere εο remains unchanged, *viz.* in Θεοκλέος Coll. 126, 1; Ἐτεοδάμα 135; Θεοτίμων 42; Τιμοκλέϝεος 36; 64; Τιμοκλέος 35; Σταστκράτεος 18, 2; Σταστκρέτεος *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 68; Τιμοκρέτεος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ii.; viii.; Φιλοκρέτεος *ibid.*, vii.

One exception is found in a late inscription, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323, where Νεομήνιος becomes Νωμήνιος. The same inscription is characterized by the *ν*-movable, an evidence of the late period to which it belongs.

**11.** ε+ω changes to ιω (in accordance with § 7, 1) in *ἴωσι*, (for *ἔωσι*, subjunctive) Coll. 60, 31. On Deecke's *φρονέωί* (*i.e.* *φρονέωσι*) 68, 4, see below, § 20, 2.

**12.** ι+ι in the Bronze Tablet does not contract, but becomes ιϳι (in accordance with § 18, 1, c), *viz.* in πτόλιϳι Coll. 60, 6. Διί *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ix. remains uncontracted after the disappearance of the ϝ. Elsewhere ι+ι contracts to ι, *viz.* in τ'Ωσίρι (for τῶ 'Οσίριι) Coll. 45; 'Οσίρι 72. Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216, 222) now reads τῶ 'Ονασίρι and 'Ονασίρι in these inscriptions, which however does not affect the question of contraction.

**13.** ο+ο contracts to ω, frequent in the gen. sing. of -ο- stems; *e.g.* ἀργύρω (for *ἀργύροο) Coll. 60, 6; Τιμοδάμω 23, 3; τῶ 29; 31, *et pass*; κατερόρκων (for *κατερόρκοον) 60, 1.

**14.** λόε Coll. 111; Φαρέω 133; χόον 88, 1; ὠτοδακῶν 103 are all too uncertain to be taken into consideration in this connection.

## 15.

### *Compensative Lengthening.*

The extent to which this prevailed in Cyprian is uncertain, owing to the nature of the syllabary, which does not distinguish the long and short vowels.

The question of compensative lengthening presents itself chiefly in the development of the group -ανϛ and -ονϛ, and here the problem is still further complicated by the fact that the nasal is regularly omitted in Cyprian before a consonant in the same word (see § 23, 1). Hence the syllables *-a·se·* can stand for -ăϛ, -ᾱϛ or even -ανϛ. So also *-o·se·* may stand for -οϛ, -ωϛ or -ονϛ.

Under these circumstances it is perhaps simplest to follow the model of the closely related Arcadian and write ἀ(ν)θρώπος, acc. plu., Coll. 60, 3 (*cf.* Arcadian τὸς συνισταμένος, Coll. 1222, 51); so κάπος 60, 30; τός 60, 3, 10, 11, 23, 30; κασιγνήτος 60, 3, 11; ἰχμαμένος 60, 3; fut. ind. ἔξο(ν)σι 60, 31; ἴω(ν)σι 60, 31 (*cf.* Arcadian κρίνωνσι, παρετάξωνσι Coll. 1222, 5, 15); acc. plu. of -ᾰ- stems, τᾶς 60, 28, 29; 71; τᾶσδε 60, 28, 29, 30; ϝρήτᾰς 60, 28, 29.

If διμώοις (for διμώσοις, see § 20, 2), Deecke's reading in Coll. 69, were certain and the inscription really a hexameter,

we should thereby be forced to admit that ο by compensative lengthening produces ω in Cyprian, at least in this instance, since the metre requires a long syllable at that point in the verse. But Deecke's transcription of the inscription is unnatural and unsatisfactory, so that his text does not afford the basis for valid conclusions. See p. 3.

There is less doubt in case of the frequent *e·mi·; e.g.* Coll. 1, 1; 16, 20, *et pass.* This form, which might be taken for *ἐμμί* (*cf.* Lesbian *ἔμμι*, Coll. 307), in accordance with the Cyprian mode of writing doubled consonants singly (see § 24, 2), is shown to be *ἠμί* by the bilinguis, Coll. 65, which, by the side of the Cyprian syllabic signs *ka·ru·xe· | e·mi·*, has ΚΑΡΥΞ ΕΜΙ. The possibility that this latter may be for *ἐμμί* is not absolutely excluded, since even inscriptions written in Greek characters, particularly in the Old Alphabet, sometimes have μ, λ, ν, *etc.* for μμ, λλ, νν.

Like *ἠμί* is *Ἀμηνί(ι)α*, Coll. 60, 18. *Cf.* Attic *Ἀμεινίας*.

## 16.

*Elision, Crasis, Aphæresis, Synizesis, Diæresis.*

1. Certain cases of elision are few; *viz. ἀφ' ὧι* Coll. 59, 3; *Κετίων κάτ' Ἠδαλίων* 59, 1; *περ' Ἠδάλιον* 60, 27; and probably *μ' ὡρίσετυ* 126, 1.

The first of these *ἀφ' ὧι* is not to be regarded as for *ἀπὺ ὧι* (on *ἀπύ* as the Cyprian form of *ἀπό*, see § 9, 2), since the elision of υ is inadmissible. The oracle in Herod. vii., 220,

*ἦ μέγα ἄστυ ἐρικυδὲς ὑπ' ἀνδράσι Περσείδῃσι,*

where the final υ of *ἄστυ* is elided according to Kühner (*Ausführliche Grammatik*, I., p. 189), cannot be cited in support of such elision, since the reading is justly suspected. *Cf.* Stein *ad loc.* *ἀφ' ὧι* is rather to be taken for *ἀπὸ ὧι* and referred for its origin to the period before final ο in Cyprian became υ. Once formed, the phrase *ἀφ' ὧι* continued as a stereotyped expression even after *ἀπό* became *ἀπύ*.

The nature of the elided vowel in *Κετίων κάτ' Ἠδαλίων*

Coll. 59, 1, cannot be determined, as the origin of the word is uncertain. (See § 34, 2.)

περ' for περί in the third of the cases cited, περ' Ἠδάλιον is poetical; but the reading seems certain. *Cf.* Pindar, *Pyth.* iii., 42; περ' αὐτᾶς; *Nem.* xi., 51 περόδοις. If with Allen (*On Greek Versification in Inscriptions*, p. 150) we take Coll. 71 as a metrical inscription (see Allen, p. 46), we shall then have elision of the final ε of ποτέ, although it is written in the text. This practice of writing the elided vowel is common even in inscriptions written in Greek characters. See examples collected by Allen, p. 127 ff.

ἀλ(λ)' ἔτυχ' ἁ κήρ Coll. 68, 3, and ποτ' ἐϝείσης 68, 1, are omitted as too uncertain. See p. 2.

The character of the Cyprian syllabary did not admit of the expression of elision except in case of words so closely connected in sense as to be written as one, like *a·po·i·* = ἀφ' ὧι, *etc.* But most words were not so written. Inscriptions which show care even separate the words by a divisor. Thus words ending in -κε-, -δε, -σε, *etc.*, would have to be written *-ke·* *-te·*, *-se·*, even if by elision the final ε disappeared, since the Cyprian had no way of expressing a final consonant without a following ε. Hence the expression of elision in case of words written separately like ὧδε ἔκερσε (*o·te· | e·ke·re·se·*); ποτε ἔϝρεξα (*po·te· | e·we·re·xa·*) was a practical impossibility.

So also in case of final -α. πά(ν)τ' ἔχεν, for instance, could be written only *pa·te· | e·ke·ne·*, which would give πά(ν)τε ἔχεν.

This fact accounts perhaps for the apparent retention of final short vowels in cases where they might be expected to suffer elision.

**2.** Crasis is apparently certain in τἀπί for τὰ ἐπί Coll. 37. In place of Deecke's τ'Ωσίρι (for τῶ Ὀσίρι) Coll. 45, 1, Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216) after a re-examination of the inscription in New York now reads τῶ Ὀνασίρι. Yet it is difficult to reconcile this reading with Hall's original facsimile (Plate viii., 34) as reproduced by Schmidt (*Sammlung Kyprischer Inschriften*, xx., 6).

Meister, *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1885, No. 51, col. 1604, reads Coll. 103 as τὼτακῶ, *i.e.* τὼ ὠτακῶ "des Ohrenkranken," and 104 as τὼπώτω, *i.e.* τῶ ἀπώτω "des Tauben." Both these conjectures are extremely doubtful.

3. Aphæresis of ι is to be assumed in οἰ (ν) τῶ, *i.e.* οἰ ἰ(ν) τῶ Coll. 60, 31. Deecke also assumes aphæresis of α in θεῶι ἀλ(λ)'; but α is written, and the reading labors under too many difficulties to be accepted as correct. So Hall's τά(ν)δε 'ν 'Απόλ(λ)ωνι (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 223) = Coll. 76, cannot be regarded as certain in view of Cesnola's plate (*Cyprus*, Plate II., 10).

Deecke's οὐ γάρ τῖ ἐπισταῖς Coll. 68 is best explained by aphæresis of ε (see Allen, *Versification in Greek Inscriptions*, p. 74) rather than by assuming a hiatus and shortening of the ι before στ, though the latter is proposed by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 80).

4. Synizesis is maintained by Deecke for θεῶι Coll. 68, 4, and θεοῖς 68, 2, with reason, if these words really begin hexameters, which is not certain. Synizesis in χόον in Coll. 88 is uncertain.

5. Diæresis is claimed by Deecke, Coll. 68, 3, in *o·vo·*, which he takes for *ov̈*. This seems hardly possible. Diæresis in such a word would be surprising under any circumstances. The parasitic ϝ (see § 17, 2) is not elsewhere found after ο, and even if it were, we should expect the last syllable of the word to appear as *vu·*, not as *vo·*. The fact that no character has yet been found for *vu·* cannot be held to support Deecke's view. If the sound had existed, the character for it would have existed also. On a similar view advanced by Deecke for Δαϝατίσαο Coll. 58; Δαϝαφᾶς ὁ 'Αϝαρος 31, 1; 32, 1, see § 18, 2.

## Consonants.

### 17.

### *F.*

1. Initial ϝ is regularly retained in Cyprian, always in the Bronze Tablet. The instances are ϝάναξ Coll. 18, 1; 59, 2;

68, 1; abbreviated to ϝα· 154; ϝανάσ(σ)ας 38, 4; 39, 2; 40, 1; ϝεικόνα 76, 2; ϝέπιϳα (ἔπος) 60, 26; ϝέτει 59, 1; 60, 1; ϝοῖ (*i.e.* σϝοῖ) 59, 3; 60, 29; ϝοίκωι 60, 6; ϝοίνω 73, 1; ϝρήτας (*cf.* ϝρήτρα) 60, 28, 29; ϝανάσ(σ)ας *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 315; 316.

The only exceptions are ἀνάσ(σ)ας Coll. 33, 1; ἔτει 76, 1; ῥέζω (doubtful) 150. The absence of initial ϝ in ἕλει Coll. 60, 9, furnishes clear evidence, in view of its retention elsewhere in the same inscription, that the word has no etymological connection with Lat. *vallis*, as still maintained by Curtius, *Grundzüge der Griechischen Etymologie*,[5] p. 360.

Medial ϝ is also regularly retained, always in the Bronze Tablet. The instances are: αἰϝεί Coll. 60, 31; ἄλϝω 60, 9, 18, 21 (*cf.* the Hesychian gloss ἄλουα· κῆποι, Κύπριοι, where ου is used to represent the bilabial character of Cyprian ϝ (see § 13, 1); βασιλῆϝος 39, 1; 46; 47; 59, 1; 60, 6, 8, 17; 153; 154; 176; 177; 178; 179; Διϝείθεμις 60, 21; δοϝέναι 60, 5, 15; ἔϝρεξα 71; ἐϝρητάσατυ 60, 14; Ἐτεϝά(ν)δρω 46; 67; εὐϝεργεσίας 71; εὐϝρητάσατυ 60, 4; Ἰδαλιῆϝες 60, 2; Θόρϝο(ν) 60, 19; ἱερῆϝος 1, 1; κατεϝόρκων (*cf.* Hom. (ϝ)έρκος) 60, 1; κενευϝόν (*i.e.* κενεϝόν; see § 13, 1) 20, 2; νεροστάτας 59, 2; Νικοκλέϝης 40; Νικοκλέϝος 179; οἴϝωι 60, 14; Ὀνασίϝοικος 27, 183; Στασίϝοικος 193; 27; 183; Τιμοϝώρω 143; Τιμοκλέϝεος 36; 64; Ἀριστοϝάναξ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, xii.; Ἀριστοκλέϝης *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1884, No. 21; Τιμοϝάνακτος *ibid.*; Ὀνασιϝοίκω *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644; Νικοκλέϝης *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 315; p. 316; ἔϝεξε (*cf.* Lat. *veho*) *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 67; βίϝα (= ζῶσα; *cf.* βί(ϝ)ος, Lat. *vivus*) Prellwitz's reading of Coll. 134 (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, ix., p. 172).

Ἀριστοκόρων, Deecke's reading in Coll. 45, 1, is not certain. Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216) after a fresh examination of the inscription in New York reads Ἀριστόγων; but this does not seem possible, judging from the copy of the inscription given by Schmidt (*Sammlung Kyprischer Inschriften*, xx., 6 a).

διζάϝω Coll. 70 is extremely doubtful.

ἐϝείσης 68, 1, has ϝ, but the exact form of the word is uncertain; see § 12, 2.

εὐζαϝεῖτε 56 is impossible as a Cyprian word; but the ϝ is certain.

Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝος Coll. 29; Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ii.; Σαμᾶϝος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380, are Phœnician names.

Ζόϝης and Ἀχαιϝός communicated by Sayce in *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1884, No. 21, are doubtful, and need confirmation.

Exceptions to the retention of a primitive medial ϝ are more frequent than in case of initial ϝ. We find the following: βασιλῆος (*cf.* βασιλῆϝος) Coll. 17, 1; 38, 1; 40, 2; 154, 155, a, b; 156; 193; Διός (*cf.* Διϝείθεμις) 73, 1; Ἐτεοδάμα (*cf.* Ἐτεϝά(ν)δρω) 135; Θεοκλέος (*cf.* Νικοκλέϝης) 126, 1; ἱερῆος (*cf.* ἱερῆϝος) 38, 3; Τιμοκλέος 35; Διί *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ix.; βασιλῆος *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 316; Νεα-? 76. Νωμήνιος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323, is a contracted form (see § 14, 10) for Νεομήνιος; *cf.* νεϝοστάτας Coll. 59, 2.

On Ἠδαλιῆϳι Coll. 60, 31 instead of Ἠδαλιῆϝι, see § 18, 4.

Several inscriptions seem to belong to a transition period and exhibit some forms with ϝ and some without; *e.g.* in Coll. 38 βασιλῆος, ἱερῆος, but ϝανάσ(σ)ας; in 39 Τιμοχάριϝος, βασιλῆϝος, ϝανάσ(σ)ας, but ἰϝερῆος; in 40 Νικοκλέϝης, ϝανάσ(σ)ας, but βασιλῆος; identical with Coll. 40 is the inscription given by Deecke in *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 316.

**2.** In addition to the ϝ above mentioned the Cyprian has developed a semi-vocalic υ between υ or ευ and a following α or ε, which it also expresses by ϝ. The instances are: δυϝάνοι (for δύ-ανοι, root δυ-; see § 9, 1) Coll. 60, 6; Εὐϝαγόρω 153; 154; abbreviated Εὐϝαγό· 155 b; 157; Εὐϝα· 155 a; 156; 159; Εὐϝά(ν)θης 163; Εὐϝά(ν)θεϝος 161; Εὐϝά(ν)θεος 162; Εὐϝέλθων 171, 172; Εὐϝέλθο(ν)τος 165; 167; 168; 169; κατεσκεύϝασε 31, 3. The preposition ὕϝαις, 60, 10, 22, 28, is also probably to be explained in the same way; see under *Prepositions*, § 33, 5.

εὐϝεργεσίας, which Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 157) refers to this

category, does not belong here, but the *ϝ* is part of the root. (*Cf.* Cyprian ἔϝρεξα Coll. 71.) βασιλεύϝο(ν)τος, 59, 1, also mentioned by Meyer in the same connection, should be omitted. The syllabic text gives only *pa·si·le·u·*, *i.e.* βασιλευ-; -ϝο(ν)τος is conjectural.

The development of this parasitic *ϝ* occurs regularly between every υ and a following ε or α. As an exception must be noted ὑευξάμενος (*i.e.* ἐπ-ευξάμενος; on ὐ-, see § 33, 4) Coll. 45, 2. Deecke's reading here has been questioned by Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216), who suggests that the sign for *u·* here is a mistake of the stone-cutter for *mi·*, lacking simply the lower transverse stroke of the sign for that syllable. This *mi·* he takes for μι(ν), with omission of the final ν (see § 23, 2, 5), regarding it as the pronoun of the 1st person; see § 31, 2. But the omission of final ν before a vowel is inadmissible; see § 23, 4. Hence I believe Deecke's reading is to be sustained.

Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 239, suggests that υευξάμενος may be for ϝευξάμενος, comparing the Hesychian glosses νέσις (*i.e.* ϝέσις)· στολή; νάλη (*i.e.* ϝάλη)· σκώληξ. But I see nothing to support this hypothesis, and should be inclined to attribute the glosses to a later stage of the dialect.

The above phenomenon of the development of a parasitic *ϝ* is not confined to the Cyprian, but occurs also in other dialects; *e.g.* Bœotian Βακεύϝαι Coll. 458; Corcyræan ἀριστεύϝοντα Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 343.

3. The *ϝ* of Τιμοχάριϝος Coll. 39, 1; 193 and Κυπροκράτιϝος 26 is difficult to explain. These words are both -ι- stems, and as such their genitives should be Τιμοχάριος, Κυπροκράτιος. That *ϝ* cannot have developed regularly between ι and ο seems clear. Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 51) suggests the following explanation. It is to be assumed that the intervocalic *ϝ* in Cyprian gradually lost its sound and disappeared as in other Greek dialects. Evidences of this have been given above in such forms as βασιλῆος ἱερῆος, as against the earlier βασιλῆϝος, ἱερῆϝος, *etc.* That the forms without *ϝ* are in general the younger there can be no reason to doubt.

Spitzer assumes that the spelling with ϝ was retained in these and similar words, as an archaism, even after the had lost its sound. *Cf.* in Latin the retention of C as G in *Cajus*, *Cnaeus*, long after C had assumed the sound of K. So in Cyprian he believes that *βασιλῆϝος etc.* continued to be written, even after *βασιλῆος* began to be spoken, and that after this analogy Τιμοχάριϝος and Κυπροκράτιϝος arose, though Τιμοχάριος and Κυπροκράτιος were spoken, the ϝ being superfluous.

This view of Spitzer has much to commend it, especially the fact that one of the inscriptions in which Τιμοχάριϝος occurs (Coll. 39) belongs clearly to the transition period when ϝ was beginning to disappear (at least in the vicinity of Paphos), as is evinced by the form *ἱερῆος* beside *ϝανάσ(σ)ας* and *βασιλῆϝος*. *Cf.* also Coll. 38 and 40. This period of uncertainty in the employment of ϝ would furnish just the conditions for the rise of forms like Κυπροκράτιϝος and Τιμοχάριϝος.

Πρώτιϝος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 379, if correct, is to be explained in the same way. So also the second ϝ of Εὐϝά(ν)θεϝος (for Εὐϝά(ν)θεος, nom. Εὐϝά(ν)θης) Coll. 161, were the reading at all certain.

## 18.

### *j.*

1. Between ι and a following α, ε or ι, a semi-vocalic ι has frequently been developed, which is generally written *j*. This is often called the parasitic *j*. The instances are the following: —

a) *j* between ι and α.

Ἀλα(μ)πριϳάται Coll. 60, 8; Ἀμηνίϳα 60, 18; ἀ(ν)δριϳά(ν)ταν (*cf.* Att. ἀνδριάς) 59, 2; ἀνοσίϳα 60, 29; Ἀριστίϳαυ 20, 1; ἀτελίϳα (Ion. ἀτελέα) 60, 23; Διϳαίθεμι 74, 1; ϝέπιϳα (Ion. ϝέπεα) 60, 26; ἱερήϳιϳαν 60, 20; ἰϳᾶσθαι 60, 3; ἰϳατῆραν 60, 3; Μαλανίϳαι 60, 17; Μιλκιϳάθωνος 59, 1; Παφίϳας 15, 1; Παφίϳα(ν) 69; πεδίϳαι 60, 18; Στασίϳας 18; Στασίϳαυ 17, 1;

*τέρχνι̯ja* 60, 9, 18, 22; *κατέθι̯jαν* 60, 27; *'Αριστί̯ja Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 52, xx.

It will be seen by the above examples that this change took place as well after the ι which developed from an original ε (see § 7, 1) as after primitive ι; *cf. ρέπι̯ja, τέρχνι̯ja, etc.*

In the Bronze Tablet this *j* has developed without exception between every ι and α. Elsewhere we find exceptions. Thus Παφίας Coll. 1, 1; 2, 1; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; Παφίαι 1, 3 (*cf.* Παφί̯ja(ν) 69; Παφί̯jας 15, 1); Γολγίαι 61; Διάθεμι(ς) (*cf.* Δι̯jαίθεμι(ς) 74, 1) 100; *ἀ(ν)δριάς Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380; *ἀ(ν)δριά(ν)ταν Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

b) *j* between ι and ε.

*ἰ̯jερεύς* Coll. 40, 1; *ἰ̯jερής* 33, 1; *ἰ̯jερῆος* 39, 3; *ἰ̯jερεύς Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 316.

This change does not hold for the Bronze Tablet, *viz.* in *ἱερήι̯jαν* 60, 20. Other exceptions are *ἱερῆρος* 1, 2; *ἱερῆος* 38, 3; Κυριεύς 193; *ἱερῆος Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 315.

*j* does not develop between ι and η. Thus we have 'Ηδαλιῆες Coll. 60, 2; 'Ηδαλιῆι 60, 31; Κετιῆες 60, 1, where we might have expected Κετι̯jη-, 'Ηδαλι̯jη-. Deecke writes these words 'Ηδαλιέες, 'Ηδαλιέι, Κετιέες. With that reading we should simply have additional illustrations of the absence of *j* between ι and ε in the Bronze Tablet.

c) *j* between ι and ι.

The only example is *πτόλι̯ι* Coll. 60, 6. On the other hand Δι*ί Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ix.

The Pamphylian exhibits precisely the same development of a parasitic semi-vowel between ι and a following vowel. This it writes (with Greek letters) as ι; *e.g. ρέτι̯α* (*i.e. ρέτι̯ja*, Ion. ἔτεα) Coll. 1267, 5; *δι̯ά ibid.*; *ἰ̯jαροῖσι*, 'Εστρέ(ν)δι̯υς (= 'Ασπένδιος) 1259.

Between ι and ο, or ι and ω, *j* never develops in Cyprian; *e.g.* Διός Coll. 73, 1; *'Αφροδισίω* 86, 4; *ἴωσι* 60, 31. The assumption therefore of Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 51) of the forms Τιμοχάρι̯jος 39, 1; *φρονί̯jωί* 68, 4, is without foundation; and Meister's conjecture of *μνάϊ̯jον* as new reading

of Coll. 41, 3 (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644) is very improbable.

2. Besides this parasitic *j* we also find *j* in the proper names Δαjατίσαο Coll. 58, which Deecke suggests may be for Δαϊτίσαο. But this is purely conjectural. Δαjαφᾶς and Ἄjαρος Coll. 31, 1; 32, 1, which Deecke previously took in the same way, are now read by him *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 319, as Τάρβας and ἀρχός.

3. Deecke's reading ἱερέjιjαν in Coll. 60, 20 makes difficulty by the presence of the first *j*. This might possibly be taken as indicating merely that the ε and ι were spoken separately, *i.e.* as εϊ. But ει elsewhere in the same inscription is not so written, *viz.* in ἔλει, line 9; ϝέτει, line 1; and it seems to me better on the whole to write ἱερήjιjαν and to consider the η as developed from ε, just as in case of the Doric adjectives in -ηιος for -εϊος (see Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 67); *e.g.* Cretan πρυτανήϊον CIG. 2554, 51; Delphian ἰαρήια CIG. 1688, 14; and the Ionic substantives ἀληθηΐη, μαντηΐη. *Cf.* also Bœotian μαντειία (*i.e.* μαντηΐα) Coll. 494, 2.

Cyprian ἱερήjιjαν is identical with these formations except that it retains the *j*, which in the other dialects disappears in the preceding η; or, we may assume that a new *j* has developed between η and following ι.

4. Ἡδαλιῆjι (Deecke writes -éjι) Coll. 60, 31 is still more perplexing. We should have expected here Ἡδαλιῆϝι, dat. sing. of Ἡδαλιεύς; *cf.* Ἡδαλιῆϝες Coll. 60, 2; Κετιῆϝες 60, 1. The form Ἡδαλιῆjι cannot be derived from Ἡδαλιῆϝι by any phonetic process, nor can I see any plausible explanation of its origin by association or analogy.

5. Change from ι to *j* before a vowel has been assumed by Deecke in case of the diphthongs ει, οι, υι in ὁσέja for ὁσεία (*i.e.* ὁσίᾱι) Coll. 41, 3; δοjâι (for δοιâι) 41, 3; φύjη (for φυίη) 126, 3. The two former of these examples are no longer maintained by Deecke (see *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 317), and the last one, φύjη, is not by any means certain in its reading.

I believe therefore that we are not as yet justified in claim-

ing this change of ι to *j* for the Cyprian. Yet the change is probable enough in itself and must have occurred in other dialects as preliminary to such forms as Arcadian ποέντω (for ποιέντω, *i.e.* ποιέντω), Coll. 1222, 9; Lesbian δικάως (for δικαίως, *i.e.* δικαίως) 304, A, 44.

6. On *jαρά* for *ἰαρά*, *i.e.* *ἱερά*, see § 1, 2.

## 19.

### ζ.

In Cyprian, ζ corresponds not only to ζ of the other dialects, *viz.* in ζᾶν (*cf.* Att. ζάω) Coll. 60, 10, 23, 28; ῥέζω (?) 150, but also sometimes to γ of the other dialects, *viz.* in ζᾶ (= γᾶ) 'earth,' Coll. 60, 8, 17, 24 and ἀζαθός (= ἀγαθός) 37, 3; 59, 4.

These two latter forms probably developed a parasitic ι̯ after the original γ, and this γι̯ then regularly became ζ. This change has an analogon in the word ζεύσασθαι (for *γι̯εύσασθαι) given by Hesychius as dialectic form of γεύσασθαι. *Cf.* the Arcadian ζέλλειν (for *γι̯έλλειν) · βάλλειν, Hesych.

## 20.

### σ

1. Final σ disappears in a few instances, *viz.* Ὀνασίωρο Α . . . (for Ὀνασίωρος Α . . .) Coll. 75, 1; Δι̯αίθεμι τῶι (for Δι̯αίθεμις τῶι) 74, 1; Διάθεμι(ς) ϝα . . . 100; κα(ς) ('and') ἀ(ν)τί 60, 5; κά(ς) μεν 71, 1; τᾶ(ς) ϝανάσ(σ)ας 38, 4; τᾶ(ς) ὑχήρων 60, 5 (twice); Γιλ(λ)ίκα(ς) Ὀνασιμάλα 120, 1; in composition πο-εχόμενον (for ποσ-εχόμενον, *i.e.* προσεχόμενον) 60, 19, 21; Εὐϝά(ν)θη(ς) 163; Ἄν(ν)α(ς) Ἀμό(ν)τα 147; Γιλ(λ)ίκα(ς) με *Studia Nicolaitana*, p. 68; ὁ ἐξ ὀρύξη Coll. 60, 12, 25 may be either for ὃς ἐξ ὀρύξη· (with omitted -ς) or ὅ may be the article used as relative.

The above data do not warrant us in drawing any positive conclusion as to the law of this change. Omitting ὁ ἐξ ὀρύξη as capable of other interpretation, the remaining twelve instances present six cases of the disappearance of -ς before

vowels, five before consonants, and one where no other sound follows. We can hardly infer from this that the disappearance of -ς took place through the medium of its change to the rough breathing, since in that event we should expect it to be confined to those cases where the following word had an initial vowel. Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 305) in judging of the Bœotian proper names in -ει for -εις assumes that the peculiarity originated before initial vowels, and was subsequently extended in its use. The same may be true for the Cyprian. But since this peculiarity is confined almost exclusively to proper names and in them is found in the whole field of Greek inscriptions, it may be better to assume a weak pronunciation of final -ς in this class of words. This, however, would leave Cyprian *τᾶ*, *κά*, and *πο-* unexplained. It should be noted that, while *κά* and *τᾶ* (for *κάς* and *τᾶς*) are found in the above-mentioned instances, the full forms *κάς* and *τᾶς* are frequent, *e.g.* *τᾶς ἀνάσ(σ)ας* Coll. 33, 1; *τᾶς εὐχωλᾶς* 59, 3; *κὰς ἐξ* 60, 6. *τᾶ Ἐτεοδάμα· πῖθι* Coll. 135, which Deecke (*ad loc.*) suggests may be for either *τᾶς Ἐτεοδάμας* or *τᾶι Ἐτεοδάμα*, is better taken with Dittenberger as *τᾶ, Ἐτεοδάμα, πῖθι*, in which *τᾶ* is the regular Cyprian form of the Homeric *τῆ* 'take,' and *Ἐτεοδάμα* is vocative. *Cf.* *ι* 347 *Κύκλωψ, τῆ, πίε οἶνον.* This would add another illustration of the influence (already beyond question) of the Homeric diction upon the Cyprian vocabulary. *Cf.* Deecke-Siegismund in Curtius' *Studien*, vii., p. 262; Smyth, *On Poetical Words in Cyprian Prose*, *Am. Jour. Phil.*, viii., 4.

*εὐχωλᾶ* Coll. 27, 2, which might also possibly be taken for a genitive or dative (see § 25, 5), is, I believe, best taken as a nominative. *Cf.* *ἀρὰ Ἀνάω* Coll. 97; *ἀρὰ Διί Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ix.

Deecke's *κὰ πότι* Coll. 68, 1; [*κὰ*] *θνατοῖς* 68, 2; and *σὶ(ς)* (for *τὶς*) 126, 1, are doubtful.

2. Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 81; p. 147) seeks to establish the loss of intervocalic *σ*, or at least its change to the rough breathing in two instances, *viz.* *φρονέωῖ* (for *φρονέωσι*) Coll. 68, 4 and *διμώοῖς* (for **διμώσοις*, *i.e.* **διμόντ̔οις*) 69.

This change is well assured for other dialects, *e.g.* Laconian ἐνήβώαις for ἐνήβώσαις Cauer, *Delectus*², 17, 15; Ἀγηΐστρατος for Ἀγησίστρατος 22, 8. The Hesychian glosses καΐνίτα, *i.e.* κασιγνήτη; σαΐμα, *i.e.* σησάμη; ΐμαον· πάταξον, and others, given as Cyprian, also point to the change in question, at least for some period of the Cyprian dialect. But the reading in the two instances claimed by Deecke cannot be regarded as certain, especially in view of the numerous difficulties of the context; see pp. 2, 3. Moreover, the prevailing usage of the dialect in all other cases is to retain the σ arising secondarily by assibilation of τ, such as we have in φρονέωσι and διμώσοις, *e.g.* ἔξβασις 31, 2; ἔξο(ν)σι 60, 31 (the (ν) not absolutely certain). *Cf.* also κασίγνητος 60, 14; βασιλεύς 17, 1.

It is, therefore, impossible from existing inscriptions to admit the existence of any such change of σ to the spiritus, as is insisted upon by Deecke. The glosses given by Hesychius are doubtless to be referred to a much later period than that to which our inscriptions belong. *Cf.* the parallel case of the Laconian glosses exhibiting rhotacism cited by Hesychius, βουαγόρ (*i.e.* βουαγός), γῶνορ (*i.e.* γῶνος). Yet this change is not attested by a single pre-Christian inscription. See Müllensiefen, *De Titulorum Laconicorum Dialecto*, p. 54 f.

3. Meister in the *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1885, No. 51, col. 1604 (*cf.* Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 23), seeks by circuitous combinations to explain another word on the above principle of ' for σ, *viz.* ποί in ποὶ τὼτακῶ, *von dem Ohrenkranken*, his proposed reading of Coll. 103. This preposition ποί he explains as follows. From primitive Greek ποτί arose in the Arcado-Cyprian dialect *ποσί by assibilation. Before vowels this appeared as πός, *e.g.* Arcadian πόσοδος Coll. 1222, 9. After the separation of the Arcadian and Cyprian, πός in Arcadian excluded its sister form *ποσί, and we accordingly find πός alone; *e.g.* πὸς τᾶι 1222, 54; ποσκατυβλάψη 1222, 38. But ποσί and πός were both retained in Cyprian. The latter occurs in πὸς Θόρϝο(ν) Coll. 60, 19; πὸς τάν 60, 19; πὸς Πασαγόραν 60, 21; *ποσί,

however, first lost its intervocalic σ (for which Meister compares φρονέωι already discussed above), becoming ποῖ and then ποί. It is this latter form which Meister reads in ποὶ τὼτακῶ Coll. 103. This ποί, he considers, became still further reduced to πο- in πο-εχόμενον for ποι̯-εχόμενον Coll. 60, 19 (*cf.* Arcadian ποέντω for ποι-έντω). This would remove the necessity of assuming loss of σ in this word, as explained above, 1.

Against this view of Meister's is to be urged

1) Assibilation of τ in case of ποτί, though naturally to be expected, is not attested by any Greek dialect. We find ποτί in Homer; *ποσί is unknown.

2) If the form *ποσί had originated from ποτί we should expect it to remain *ποσί, since the σ arising in this way is not wont to disappear. *Cf.* εἴκοσι (primitive form ϝίκατι), φάσις (from *φάτις).

3) The example, which Meister cites to illustrate the disappearance of σ arising from τ before ι, *viz.* φρονέωί, we have already seen above (2) is quite doubtful and opposed to the clear laws of the dialect. Argive ποί, which Meister cites (relying evidently upon Cauer, *Delectus*², 62, 9 and Etym. Mag. 678, 44) is not sufficiently assured. Locrian ποῖ τόν, which Bechtel defends in Coll. 1479, 14, is taken by Allen (*De dialecto Locrensium*, p. 67 = *Studien*, iii., p. 271) and Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 322, b, 5, as a mistake of the stone-cutter for πὸτ τόν, in which πότ is by apocope for ποτί. *Cf.* Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,² § 299, note. Allen compares Locrian ΚΑΙΤΟ, which he takes for κὰτ τό, Coll. 1478, 46.

4) As to the origin of ποεχόμενον from ποιεχόμενον by the disappearance of the ι (through the medium of ι̯), such a change should be accepted cautiously, even were the existence of ποί proven. We have no instances of the Cyprian treatment of the ι̯ (*j*) developing from the second part of diphthongs (αι, ει, οι, υι) unless perchance φύ̯η Coll. 126, 3 be such an instance. That certainly would not make for Meister's view, but would lead us rather to expect ποι̯εχόμενον.

## 21.

### π.

Indogermanic *q* [1] apparently develops irregularly as π (instead of τ) before ε and ι in several words: —

1. πείσει (Idg. root *qei-*), Coll. 60, 12, 25, corresponds to Attic τείσει (on this and not τίσει as the correct form, see above, § 12, *ad in.*), fut. ind. 'shall pay.' Attic τείσει represents the regular development of *q*. Cyprian πείσει has undoubtedly borrowed its π from other formations of the same root, where π was phonetically justified, *e.g.* *πέ-ποι-α (perfect), ποινή 'pay.' *Cf.* Thessalian ἀππεισάτου (*i.e.* ἀποτεισάτω) Coll. 1332, 28, where the same irregularity occurs.

2. πεφαμέρων, Coll. 59, 2, *i.e.* πε(μ)φαμέρων (see § 23, 1, 2) gen. sing. of πε(μ)φ-άμερον, 'five days' period' (*cf.* Att. πενθήμερον) points to πέμπε (Idg. *penqe*) as the form of the numeral for 'five' in Cyprian as well as in Lesbian. Here also the π (for τ) owes its origin to the influence of other primitive formations from the stem *penq-*, *e.g.* πεμπάς, where the π before α was regular.

3. In ὅπισις (= ὅστις; see § 22, 2) ὅπι- is an adverbial formation from the pronominal root *qi-*, which like πείσει (see above, 1), ought regularly to appear as -τι-. The π is to be explained as borrowed from forms such as ὅπως, ὁπότερος *etc.*, where π for Indogermanic *q* before ο and ω is regular.

## 22.

### *Assibilation of* τ *before* ι.

1. This occurs as in Attic in the verbal ending -(ν)σι (see above) for -ντι, and elsewhere. The examples are ἔξο(ν)σι for ἔξοντι (Att. ἔξουσι) Coll. 60, 31; ἴω(ν)σι 60, 31; ἐξβασις (Att. ἔκβασις; see § 24, 1) 31, 2; 32, 1; πόσις 26, 2.

ἔτι 73, 1 and ἀ(ν)τί 60, 5, *et pass.* retain the τ as in all dialects.

[1] Following Brugmann's use of this character in his *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik.*

*κάτι* has been assumed by Deecke, as the full form of the elided *κάτ'* 'and' in *κάτ' Ἡδαλίων* Coll. 59, 1. If this is correct, the form would belong with *ἔτι* and *ἀ(ν)τί*. At all events we are not justified in assuming that the form *κάς* 'and' originated from *κάτι* by the latter's becoming **κάσι*, whence (before vowels) *κάς*.

So also *πός* Coll. 60, 19, 20, 21 is not to be explained as the ante-vocalic form of **ποσί* (for *ποτί*), since *ποτί* so far as known never assibilates its *τ*. The *ς* of *πός* must be explained in some other way; see § 33, 3. *ποτ'*, which Deecke reads in Coll. 68, 1, by elision for *ποτί*, is perfectly consistent with the existence of *πός* in Cyprian (see § 33, 3), but the context is so doubtful that small probability attaches to this form.

**2.** The indefinite *σὶς* (for *τὶς*) occurs Coll. 60, 10, 23; and *ὅπισις* 60, 29. This is irregular, since initial *τ* before *ι* is not assibilated; yet the form is certain. Possibly, *τὶς* as an enclitic, was so closely connected with the preceding word as to be felt as a part of it. In this way the *τ* became intervocalic and so changed to *σ*. This is the explanation of Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*[2], § 299, and in support of it may be cited Att. *ἄττα*, which developed from the primitive nom. pl. neuter of *τὶς*, *viz. τι̯ά*, in such phrases as *χρήματά τι̯α*. The two words in such instances were so closely connected as to be treated like one. Hence *χρήματά τι̯α* became regularly *χρήματάττα*. This was felt as *χρήματ' ἄττα*, so that *ἄττα* arose as an independent word. The only objection that can be urged against this explanation of *σὶς* is that Hesychius gives us *σί* as an interrogative pronoun in the gloss *σί βόλε· τί θέλεις. Κύπριοι.*

Deecke's *τὶ* in Coll. 68, 3, is to be rejected. The reading is uncertain, and the form highly improbable by the side of *σὶς*.

**3.** Deecke reads *πότι* Coll. 68, 3, as vocative of *πότις*, 'lord.' The word occurs, however, in 26 as *πόσις*, with regular assibilation of the *τ*. The fact that we always find *πόσις* in other dialects would certainly tend under any cir-

cumstances to discredit πότις in Cyprian, especially as τ in this dialect regularly suffers assibilation; but the assumption that πότις existed beside πόσις in the same dialect is entirely untenable. Another fact which makes against Deecke's reading is that the word never has the sense of 'lord' in Greek, a sense which he attaches to it in the present instance.

## 23.

### *Loss of Nasals.*

1. Before a consonant in the same word the nasals ν, μ, γ were always dropped. This is generally indicated by putting the omitted nasal in parenthesis. The instances are the following: —

1) Omission of ν.

ἀ(ν)δριϳά(ν)ταν (Att. ἀνδριάντα) COLL. 59, 2; ἀ(ν)θρώπος 60, 3; ἀ(ν)τί 60, 5, 15, 17; Ἀμό(ν)τα (?) 147; Λ(ν)τίφαμος 83; Ἀριστόφα(ν)τος 28; ἐπιό(ν)τα 60, 9, 19, 22; Ἐτεϝά(ν)δρω 46; 47; Εὐϝά(ν)θη 163; Εὐϝά(ν)θεος 161; 162; Εὐϝέλθο(ν)τος 165; 167; 168; 169; ἰό(ν)τα 60, 23; Ὀνάσα(ν)τος 30; πά(ν)τα 60, 10, 19, 22; 68, 4; ταλά(ν)των 60, 7; τά(ν)δε 60, 26; 76, 2; 88, 1; τό(ν)δε 59, 2; 60, 13, 25; 72, 1; Φα(ν)τασίω 81; ἀ(ν)δριά(ν)ταν *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323; ἀ(ν)δριάς *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380.

2) Omission of μ.

πε(μ)φαμέρων COLL. 59, 2; Ἀλα(μ)πριϳάται (*cf.* the present "Alambra, twenty minutes' ride west of Dali," Cesnola, *Cyprus*, p. 87). Meister's conjecture of ὀ(μ)βά[ντι] in his new reading of COLL. 41 (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644) is quite uncertain.

3) Omission of γ.

Probable in Ὄ(γ)κα(ν)τος COLL. 60, 9; Πα(γ)κρα- 62, 2.

In Pamphylian inscriptions ν disappears similarly before τ or δ in the same word; τ under such circumstances changes to δ, *e.g.* πεδεκαίδεκα (*i.e.* πεντεκαίδεκα) COLL. 1267, 5; ἐξάγωδι (*i.e.* ἐξάγωντι) 1267, 16, 20; γένωδαι 1267, 20; Ἐστρέδιμς (Ἀσπένδιος) 1259.

**2.** Certain short words ending in a nasal, and closely connected in thought with the following word, omit the nasal, as in the interior of a word. These words are the forms of the article *τόν, τάν, τῶν*; the preposition *ἰν*; and the pronoun *μιν* (= *μεν, i.e. με*; see § 31, 1). The instances are

1) *τόν*:

*τὸ(ν) χῶρον* Coll. 60, 18; *τὸ(ν) χρυόμενον* 60, 9; *τὸ(ν) χραυζόμενον* 60, 18; *τὸ(ν) ποεχόμενον* 60, 19, 21; *τὸ(ν) Δρυμίων* 60, 19; *τὸ(ν) κᾶπον* 60, 20; as relative in *τὸ(ν) Διρεί θεμις* 60, 21; *τὸ(ν) δόμε(ν)* 126, 2 is improbable; see § 31, 4;

2) *τάν*:

*τὰ(ν) πτόλιν* 60, 1; *τὰ(ν) δάλτον* 60, 26; *τὰ(ν) θιόν* 60, 27; *τὰ(ν) δίφατο(ν)* 69; *τὰ(ν) ϝεικόνα* 76, 2;

3) *τῶν*:

*τῶ(ν) παίδων* 60, 11, 30; *τῶ(ν) κασιγνήτων* 60, 14;

4) *ἰν*:

*ἰ(ν) τύχαι* 17, 2; 27, 2; 28; 31, 4; 37, 3; 59, 4; 72, 2; *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323; 1887, No. 12, col. 380; *ἰ(ν) τῶι* Coll. 60, 1, 3, 8, 9; *ἰ(ν) ταῖ* 60, 8; *ἰ(ν)* Μαλανίϳαι 60, 17; *ἰ(ν)* Σίμ(μ)ιδος 60, 20; *οἳ (ν) τῶ* (with aphæresis of the ι; see § 16, 3) 60, 31;

5) *μιν*:

*μὶ(ν) κατέθηκε* 1, 2; 2, 2; probably also in *σὺ(ν) τύχα* 120, 4.

The above words always lose the *ν* before a consonant, without exception. The forms *τόν, τάν, etc.*, occur only before vowels.

The omission of *ν* has also been claimed by Meyer (*Gr. Gr.*[2], § 113, note) for *ἤν* (*i.e. ἐάν*). Meyer would read *ἤ(ν) κε* in Coll. 60, 10, 23. But the existence of *ἤν* has already been shown to be improbable (see § 14, 6), and Deecke's reading *ἠ* (= *εἰ*) is sufficiently justified by the occurrence of *ἠ* in Cretan.

**3.** Loss of final *ν* before an initial consonant in other cases than those above mentioned is to be accepted with caution. *Θόρϝο(ν) τόν* Coll. 60, 19 and *ἄλϝο(ν) τόν* 60, 21 seem certain. But other instances given by Deecke are doubtful,

*viz.* *ναὸ(ν) τό(ν)δε* COLL. 41, 2, which he no longer maintains (see p. 3), and *τὰ(ν) δίφατο(ν) δίμαο(ν) Παφίϳα(ν) γε* COLL. 69. This latter instance might possibly seem worthy of acceptance did we thereby gain a reading which commended itself in other respects, which is not the case. The individual words of the passage are several of them strange, and the sense which Deecke attaches to them (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 146 f.) is forced and unnatural. Equally improbable is Hall's *ἀ(ν)θρώπω(ν) θεῶι* (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 220), which he reads in place of Deecke's *ἄ(ν)θρωπε θεῶι* COLL. 68, 3.

**4.** In COLL. 126, 2, Deecke would even maintain the disappearance of final *ν* before a vowel in *δόμε(ν) Ἄδη*. This is also assumed by Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 216) in his reading *μὶ(ν) εὐξάμενος* in place of Deecke's *ὑευξάμενος* (*i.e.* *ἐπευξάμενος*; see § 17, 2) COLL. 45; further in *Κυνέμω(ν) ὁσεία* (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 226) COLL. 87; *Ἀντιφάμω(ν) ὁ* (*ibid.*, p. 225) COLL. 83. But in none of these cases does any probability attach to the reading.

## 24.

### *Other Peculiarities.*

**1.** Triple consonance occurs in *ἔξβασιν* COLL. 32. So also the preposition *ἐξ* is used invariably before initial consonants, *ἐξ τῶι* 60, 5, 11, 24; *ἐξ ταῖι* 60, 6, 24.

**2.** Doubled consonants are regularly written singly, *viz.* in *ἀνάσ(σ)ας* COLL. 33, 1; *ϝανάσ(σ)ας* 38, 4; 39, 2; 40; *Ἀμ(μ)ῦς* 61; *Ἄν(ν)ας* 147; *Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι* 31, 3; 32, 2; 59, 3; 72, 2; 74, 2; 75, 3; 77; 78; 120, 2; *Γιλ(λ)ίκα(ς)* 120, 1; *Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝος* 29; *Πάσιπ(π)ος* 194; *Σίμ(μ)ιδος* (?) 60, 20; *μαμ(μ)οπάτωρ* (?) 85; *ϝανάσ(σ)ας* *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 315; p. 316; *Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝι* *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ii.; doubtful is *ἀλ(λ)'* COLL. 68, 3; *Μανασ(σ)ῆς* *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

Instead of *Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι* the principles of the Cyprian syllabary would admit *Ἀπλῶνι* (*cf.* Thessalian *Ἄπλουνι*, *i.e.* *Ἄπλωνι* COLL. 368; 372; *Ἄπλουνος* 345, 22). On the other

hand Cyprian *e·mi·* might possibly be taken for ἔμ(μ)ι, except for the evidence of ΚΛΡVΞ ΕΜΙ the Greek text of the bilinguis Coll. 65 (*cf.* § 16).

This practice of writing doubled consonants singly is not peculiar to the Cyprian, but is found more or less frequently in most archaic inscriptions of every dialect. *Cf.* Syracusan Ἀπέλωνι Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 509; Megarian Ἀπόλωνι *ibid.*, 11; Pamphylian Ἀπέλωνα Coll. 1267, 30; τιμάρεσα 1267, 6 and the list given in Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 287.

3. N-movable is found in a few late inscriptions, *viz.* ἔδωκεν Ἀψάσωμος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380; ἔδωκεν κάς and ὀνέθηκεν Μανασ(σ)ῆς *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323; in the two latter cases before an initial consonant.

4. The Cyprian syllabary has no character for the rough-breathing, which is generally supplied in accordance with the vulgar usage.

5. Initial πτ for π appears in πτόλις Coll. 60, 2, 4, 7, 15, 16, 27; πτόλιϳι 60, 6; πτόλιν 60, 1, all doubtless to be referred to Homeric influence; see § 20, 1.

6. Primitive ρσ is retained in ἔκερσε Coll. 32, 2, in accordance with the regular law. *Cf.* on the other hand Arcadian φθέραι (*i.e.* φθήραι?) Coll. 1222, 8.

7. Hall's Σίϳα (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 225) for Θιϳά, *i.e.* θεά, his reading in Coll. 85, cannot be admitted. The change of θ to σ found in late Laconian (see Müllensiefen, *De Titulorum Laconicorum Dialecto*, p. 56) is not probable for Cyprian; and *goddess* in this dialect is expressed regularly by θεός (fem. as well as masc.), *e.g.* Coll. 60, 27.

8. κυμερῆναι, Coll. 68, 4, if correctly taken as a collateral form of *κυβερνῆναι, represents the same change of β to μ as that seen in κυμερνήτης for κυβερνήτης, Etymologicum Magnum, 543, 2, where it is referred to the Αἰολεῖς. Further concerning the form, see § 32, 12.

## INFLECTIONS.

### Declension.

### 25.

*Stems in* -ᾱ-.

1. On the gen. sing. in -αυ and -αο of proper names in -αϛ, see above, § 14, 4.

2. Feminine -ᾱ- stems have everywhere -ᾱϛ in the gen. sing., *e.g.* Ἀθάνας Coll. 60, 20; ἀνάσ(σ)ας 33, 1; εὐχωλᾶς 59, 3; ϝανάσ(σ)ας 38, 4; 39, 2; 40, 1; Ὀνασικύπρας 34, 1; τᾶς 1, 1 *et pass.*; Τιμοκύπρας 23, 1; Φιλοκύπρας 22, 1; Ἀριστοκύπρας *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, vi. No trace is anywhere found of a fem. gen. in -αυ such as occurs in Arcadian (*e.g.* οἰκίαυ Coll. 1233, 3; ζαμίαυ 1222, 12, 25), where it is borrowed from the masculine. On the occasional omission of -ϛ in the gen. sing., see § 20, 1.

3. A peculiar gen. sing. of masc. -ᾱ- stems is found in Ἀμηνίϝᾱ Coll. 60, 18; Ὀνασιμάλᾱ 120, 1; Ἀριστίϝᾱ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 52, xx. The formation can hardly be Cyprian. It is possibly the result of Doric influence; *cf.* Cretan δικαστᾶ (for -ᾶο), *Inscription of Gortyna*, v. 35. This explanation at all events seems preferable to that of Deecke, who believes that Cyprian -ᾱο could sometimes lose its -ο and appear as -ᾱ.

4. Εὐϝαγόρω (*cf.* on the other hand Ὀνασαγόραυ Coll. 60, 1, 22) Coll. 153, 154, is referred by Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 345, to the influence of the Ionic dialect, but such Ionic gens. as Λαμψαγόρεω (Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1884, p. 86) certainly do not speak for an Ionic Εὐϝαγόρω, although -ῶ (by contraction for -έω) does sometimes occur in Ionic, *e.g.* Ἀννικῶ for Ἀννικέω Roehl, *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae*, 381, c, 11.

Ἀμύ(ν)τω Coll. 41, which Meyer also explains in the same manner, is no longer maintained as a reading by Deecke; see p. 3.

**5.** The dat. sing. ends sometimes in -ᾱι (*i.e.* ᾳ); sometimes in -ᾱ. On the relation of these two endings to each other, see above, § 13, 3, a. The instances (with the immediate context) are as follows: *τᾶ* 'Α*θάνα τᾶι* Coll. 62; *ὐ τύχα* 74, 3; *σὺ(ν) τύχα* 120, 4; *τᾶ* 'Α*θάναι* 17, 2; *τᾶι βασιλῆϝος τᾶ* 60, 8, 17; *τᾶ* Π*αφία*, the correct reading of Coll. 9, according to Hall (*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, xi., p. 212). An examination of these examples reveals the fact that the dative in -ᾱ is more usually found in those cases where it is accompanied by another dative of the full form in -ᾱι. *Cf.* the similiar use of -ω for -ωι; see § 26, 3.

Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv., p. 13 f.) considers the forms in -ᾱι as locative, when they are accompanied by a preposition of place. But the locative in Greek is not elsewhere used as such with prepositions, and there is no ground for recognizing it here.

**6.** The gen. plu. in -ᾶν (by contraction from -ᾱ́ων; *cf.* Homeric *θεᾱ́ων, ἀλφηστᾱ́ων*) occurs in *ἐπαγομενᾶν* Coll. 59, 2.

**7.** On the acc. plu. see § 15.

## 26.

*Stems in* -ο-.

**1.** The gen. sing. in -ω (for -οο by contraction; see § 14, 13) is frequent, *e.g.* *ἄλϝω* Coll. 60, 9, 18; *ἀργύρω* 60, 6, 13, 15, 17; Τ*ιμοδάμω* 23, 3.

**2.** A peculiar gen. sing. is found ending in -ων instead of -ω and occurring interchangeably with the latter. The instances are: 'Α*βιδμίλκων* Coll. 59, 3; *ἀργύρων* 60, 7, 25 (*cf.* *ἀργύρω* 60, 6, 15, *et pass.*); Δ*ρυμίων* 60, 19; 'Ε*χετίμων* 38, 2; 'Η*δαλίων* 59, 1; Θ*εοδώρων* 42; Θ*εοτίμων* 42; Κ*ετίων* 59, 1; *μισθῶν* 60, 4, 5, 15; 'Ο*ναίων* 21, 1 (shown to be genitive by the recently discovered Ὄ*ναιός ἠμι Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, iii.); 'Ο*νασικύπρων* Coll. 60, 2, 11, 30; 'Ο*νασίλων* 60, 24; *π*ε(μ)*φαμέρων* 59, 2; *ταλά(ν)των* 60, 7; *ὐχήρων* 60, 5, 15; Φ*ιλοκύπρων* 60, 1; Ν*ωμηνίων Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323. *τῶν* in Coll. 60, 11 is not to be taken as gen. sing.

(as given by Deecke, *Index* to Coll. I., 1) but is rather the gen. plu. modifying the preceding *παίδων*. *Cf.* *τὸς παῖδας τὸς Ὀνασίλων* 60, 23.

The explanation of this genitive formation is exceedingly difficult. The view of Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv., 13) that an original formation in *-ως* has changed its *-ς* to *-ν*, for which Ahrens compares the Dor. ending *-μες* (*e.g.* *ὀμωμόκαμες*) by the side of the ordinary *-μεν* (*λέγομεν*) hardly needs refutation. The view first advanced by Deecke-Siegismund (Curtius' *Studien*, vii., p. 232) identifying this formation with that seen in the Arcadian genitive *τωνί* (Coll. 1222, 38), which they took as *των-ί*, is hardly correct, since Arcadian *ταν[ν]ί* in the same inscription line 53 points to a suffix *-νι*. The existence of this latter seems also to be confirmed by the Thessalian forms in *-νε*, *τό-νε* Coll. 345, 20, *et pass.*; *τά-νε* 345, 23, 45.

More plausible than Ahrens's view is that put forward by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 71). Deecke thinks the ending *-ων* arose by confounding the gen. sing. in *-ω* with the gen. pl. The *ν* in the latter (see § 23, 2) had an extremely weak sound, according to Deecke, so that the form apparently terminated in *-ω*, at least when followed by an initial consonant. Hence after the analogy of *ἀ(ν)θρώπω*, *i.e.* *-ω(ν)* as a pendant to *ἀ(ν)θρώπων* in the gen. plu., we find also in the gen. sing. *ἀ(ν)θρώπων* as a pendant to *ἀ(ν)θρώπω*. Deecke refers to the early Latin accusatives, *sēd*, *mēd*, *tēd*, which are correctly regarded by him as having developed from original *sē*, *mē*, *tē* after the analogy of the duplicate ablative forms *sēd*, *sē*; *tēd*, *tē*; *mēd*, *mē*. *Cf.* Osthoff, *Zur Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen*, p. 128; Stolz, *Lateinische Grammatik*, § 90.

Against this view of Deecke's it must be urged that except in the few words already mentioned above (§ 23, 2, 3) final *ν* does not exhibit a tendency to vanish in Cyprian. Even before consonants it is regularly written, *e.g.* *παίδων* 60, 11; *κασιγνήτων* 70, 14. Hence the assumption is not justified that final *ν* in the gen. plu. was characterized by the "äusserste Lautschwäche" which Deecke claims, and the con-

clusion drawn from this assumption, that there existed two forms in the gen. plu., one in -ω and one in -ων, is therefore equally without foundation. In the absence of these duplicate forms of the gen. plu. it is difficult to see how this could have furnished the motive for the new formation.

Others, as Leskien (*Berichte der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1884, p. 105) and Brugmann (*Griechische Grammatik*, § 94) suggest an independent ending here, *-m* or *-om*, which appears in Eccl. Slavonic. This is improbable. It is not likely that the Cyprian -ο- stems had two inherited genitive formations in regular use. The one would have almost inevitably supplanted the other in the ordinary language. Latin *familiās* beside *stellae* is a rarity; *deābus* and *filiābus* have a special reason for existing; whereas these two genitives in -ω and -ων exist side by side in the same words in the same inscription. It is therefore more reasonable to view the gen. sing. in -ων as a purely Cyprian development, the result of certain influences or associations which cannot as yet be determined.

3. The dat. sing. ends sometimes in -ωι, sometimes in -ω. On the relation of these two endings, see above, § 13, 3, c. An examination of the examples given there, reveals the fact that the ending -ω is used only in those cases where it is accompanied by another dative of the full form in -ωι, or by one ending in -αι or -ι. This fact tends to discredit Deecke's reading of Ἀ(ι)δη(ι) *μισαάτω(ι)* Coll. 126, 2 and *τῶ(ι) ἀ(ν)θρώπω(ι) ibid.* 3. Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv., p. 13 f.) considers the forms in -ωι as locatives wherever they are accompanied by a preposition, and writes them -οι. *Cf.* his view of the corresponding ending -ᾱι in case of the -ᾱ- stems; see above, § 25, 5.

4. On the acc. plu. in -ος, see above, § 15.

5. A locative sing. in -οῖ seems to occur in Παφοῖ Coll. 56, 1 and Ἠδαλιοῖ 62, 1; possibly also in Ἀμυκλοῖ 59, 2.

## 27.

### *Stems in* -ι-.

πτόλις forms the dat. sing. πτόλιϳι (*i.e.* πτόλιι ; see § 18, 1, c) COLL. 60, 2. This represents the primitive formation. So also the contracted Ὀσίρι COLL. 72 ; 45, 2. See § 14, 12.

## 28.

### *Nouns in* -εύς.

Deecke writes the oblique cases of these as -έϝος, -έϝι, *etc.*, or with disappearance of ϝ, as -έος, -έι, *etc.* He evidently assumes -έϝος to be the primitive formation. This makes a difficulty in explaining the long vowel in the penult of these words in other dialects, *e.g.* Bœotian Θεσπιεῖος (= Θεσπιῆος), COLL. 494, 16; Thessalian βασιλεῖος (ει = η) 345, 2, 11 ; Lesbian βασίλης 304, A, 13 ; Ionic Πλουτῆος CIG. 2665, b ; Elean βασιλᾶες (for βασιλῆες ; ᾱ for η as frequent in Elean) COLL. 1152, 3 ; Att. βασιλέως, βασιλέᾱ, βασιλέᾶς (for βασιλῆος, βασιλῆα, βασιλῆας, by quantitative metathesis ; *cf.* Old Attic οἰκῆος, given in a law in Lysias 10, 19). Assuming -έϝος, *etc.*, as the original formation, the long vowel in these forms can be explained only by compensative lengthening. But certain as a few instances of this phenomenon seem to be, *e.g.* ᾱ̓ώς for *ἀϝώς (*cf.* Lesbian αὔως), yet the existence of a uniform law, by which a short vowel, standing before ϝ, is lengthened when ϝ disappears, cannot be established. Such words as νέος (for νέϝος), πλόος, ῥόος, κλέος, γλυκέος, βοός, *etc.*, in fact, are so numerous as to seem rather to disprove it.

It is better, therefore, to assume that the original stem of these nouns ended in -ηυ-, not -ευ-. The nom. sing. then must have originally ended in -ηύς. This developed regularly to -εύς ; *cf.* βοῦς for *βωῦς ; νᾶῦς for *νᾱυς (Ionic νηῦς is of secondary origin after νῆες) ; λόγοις for *λόγωις (*cf.* Skrt. *gatāís*). See Spitzer, *Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 30 ; *cf.* Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 298.

The oblique cases were originally *-ῆϝος, -ῆϝι, etc.*, and Deecke is therefore wrong in writing *βασιλέϝος*, *Κετιέϝες*. The Cyprian is the only dialect which has preserved the primitive formation intact. All other dialects have dropped *ϝ*. The instances of the formation are *βασιλῆϝος* COLL. 39, 1; 46; 47; 59, 1; 60, 6, 8, 17; 153; 154; 176; 177; 178; 179; *Ἠδαλιῆϝες* 60, 2; *ἱερῆϝος* 1, 1; *Κετιῆϝες* 60, 1.

As to the Cyprian forms which appear without the *ϝ* (see § 17, 1), they must be considered as retaining *η*, if the theory advanced below concerning the origin of *ἱερῆς* be correct; see § 29, 2. The instances are: *βασιλῆος* COLL. 17, 1; 38, 1; 40, 2; 154, 155 a, b; 156; 193; *ἱερῆος* 38, 3; *βασιλῆος* *Bezz. Beitr.*, xi., p. 316.

## 29.

### *Other Peculiarities of Declension.*

1. Peculiar are the accusatives *ἰjατῆραν* (= *ἰjατῆρα*) COLL. 60, 3; *ἀ(ν)δριjά(ν)ταν* 59, 2; *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

Brugmann (*Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik*, I., p. 198, and *Gr. Gr.*, § 77) suggests that possibly the *-αν* of these forms is to be regarded as the development of *-m̥m: i.e.* the primitive ending *-m* developed before it the vocalic *m̥*, just as in Sanskrit **pádm* became **pádm̥m* whence *pádam*. *Cf.* also Greek *πότνιαν* (whence the secondary nom. *πότνια* instead of **πότνις*; *cf.* Skrt. *pátnī*) from **πότνιᾱm̥m*. It seems much more natural, however, in view of the acc. sing. *μέ-ν*, *μί-ν* (for *μέ*, see § 31, 1) to regard the *ν* as borrowed from the accusative of the *-ᾱ-* and *-o-* stems, as if to mark more closely the accusative character of the form. *Cf.* Thessalian *κιόναν* (from *κιών*) COLL. 1332, 40. The late forms *νύκτα-ν* and *ἄνδρα-ν* which Brugmann cites admit of no other explanation. An analogous phenomenon is seen in the verb where a primitive 3d plu. imperative *γραψάτω* first inserts a pluralizing *ν*, producing *γραψάντω*, and then adds yet another plural sign in *γραψάντων*. *Cf.* also Attic *μισθωσάντωσαν* CIA. ii., 600, 45.

ϝεικόνα Coll. 76, 2, follows the ordinary formation.

ἀτελήν Coll. 60, 10, does not belong here; see below, **8**.

**2.** The nom. sing. ἰϝερής Coll. 33, 1 is a collateral form of ἰϝερεύς (*i.e.* ἱερεύς), formed probably by appending the regular nom. ending -ς to ἱερη-, which appeared as the stem in those forms of ἰϝερεύς which in course of time came to drop the ϝ (see § 17, 1), as, *e.g.*, ἰϝερῆ-ος, ἰϝερῆ-ι. This new formation occurs also in Arcadian (*e.g.* γραφής Coll. 1230, 7; ἱερής 1231, B, *et pass.*), where, however, it must have originated independently, if the above explanation of the Cyprian form is correct.

**3.** Proper names in -κλέϝης (*e.g.* Νικοκλέϝης Coll. 40, 1) formed the gen. sing. regularly in -κλέϝεος (*i.e.* -κλέϝε(σ)ος). This formation is seen in Τιμοκλέϝεος Coll. 36; 64. By disappearance of the ϝ (see § 17, 1) and hyphæresis of the second ε (see § 14, 7) we get the forms in -έος, *viz.* Τιμοκλέος 35 and Θεοκλέος 126, 1. Νικοκλέϝος 179 cannot be the legitimate offspring of Νικοκλέϝεος (*cf.* Τιμοκλέϝεος), since ε before ο does not disappear. I therefore prefer to regard Νικοκλέϝος not as a form historically intermediate between Νικοκλέϝεος and Νικοκλέϝος, but as historically subsequent to both, and a compromise between the two. *Cf.* German *doppelt*, which has resulted from the combination of *doppel* and *gedoppelt*. See Wheeler, *Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language*, p. 8.

**4.** On the nom. of proper names in -κράτης and -κρέτης, gen. -κράτεος and -κρέτεος, see above, § 3, 1.

**5.** On Εὐϝά(ν)θεϝος as possible gen. of Εὐϝα(ν)θης, see § 17, 3.

**6.** χάρι and δάρι Meister's reading of Coll. 41 (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644) for χάριτι and δώρατι are quite uncertain.

**7.** Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝος Coll. 29; Γιλ(λ)ίκαϝι *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 41, ii.; Σαμᾶϝος *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 12, col. 380, are Phœnician names (see Deecke on the last form) from nominatives Γιλ(λ)ίκας (*cf.* Γιλ(λ)ίκα(ς) Coll. 120) and Σαμᾶς.

**8.** ἀτελήν (acc. sing. of ἀτελής) Coll. 60, 10, is formed

after the analogy of masculine -ᾱ- stems (-ᾱς : -ᾱν : : -ης : -ην). *Cf.* Lesbian δαμοτέλην Coll. 304, A, 44. Meister (*Griechische Dialekte*, I., p. 154 f.). See above, § 14, 6; 29, 1.

## 30.

### *Adjectives.*

The form νεϝοστάτας Coll. 59, 2, is taken by Ahrens (*Philologus*, xxxv.) as for νεϝοτάτας, *i.e.* superlative of νέϝος (Att. νέος). The ending -στατος in that case must be explained as borrowed from the superlative of -εσ- stems, *e.g.* ἀσφαλέστατος. This occurs also in other dialects, *e.g.* αἰδοιέστατος (superlative of αἰδοῖος) Pindar, *Ol.* iii. 76; ἀφθονέστερος Plato, *Rep.* 460, B, where the adaptation to the -εσ- stems is more complete than in case of νεϝόστατος.

## 31.

### *Pronouns.*

1. The acc. sing. μέν for μέ occurs in Coll. 71, the ν apparently being added on the same principle as in ἰϳατῆραν for ἰϳατῆρα; see § 29, 1.

2. Another form of the acc. sing. is μί Coll. 1, 2; 2, 2. This form, which is for μίν with omitted final nasal (see § 23, 2, 5), must have developed from μέν, just as ἰν from ἐν; see above, § 7, 2. μέ also occurs Coll. 15, 2, and (elided) 126, 1. Voigt reads μὶν ἔθηκε in Coll. 45, 3; but see § 9, 4.

3. ϝοῖ occurs as a simple pronoun of the 3d person without reflexive force (= αὐτῷ) in Coll. 60, 29; 59, 3.

4. Deecke claims τό(ν) as demonstrative in τὸ(ν) δόμε(ν) Ἄδη 126, 2, but the whole passage is extremely uncertain.

The nom. pl. masc. of the article is οἱ after the analogy of the singular ὁ. The primitive nom. pl. τοί has disappeared as in Attic and elsewhere.

5. The article occurs as relative several times, *viz.* τόν Coll. 60, 21; τάς 71; possibly also ὅ, 60, 12, 25, unless this

be for ὅς with omitted final -ς, according to § 20, 1. τά, which Deecke reads in 68, 4, is doubtful; *cf.* p. 2.

**6.** On σὶς for τὶς Coll. 60, 10, 23, see § 22, 2. On ὅπισις (= ὅστις), see § 21, 3; 22, 2.

**7.** Deecke claims σὶ(ς) in relative sense in Coll. 126, 1, comparing Thessalian κίς κε in τὰν ὀνάλαν, κίσκε γινύειτει (= ἥτις ἂν γίγνηται) Coll. 345, 22. But the reading of the Cyprian form is quite uncertain. *Cf.* § 20, 1 *ad fin.*

**8.** A demonstrative τόννν seems to occur in the bilingual in *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1886, No. 42, col. 1323.

**9.** ϝεαυτῶ, Meister's conjecture in his new reading of Coll. 42 (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1887, No. 52, col. 1644), is exceedingly improbable.

## 32.

### Conjugation.

**1.** In Coll. 60, 1, Deecke writes κατεϝόρκων from an assumed present κατα-ϝορκόω, 'besiege' (*cf.* πολιορκέω for πολι-ϝορκέω). Hence κατεϝόρκων is the regular contracted 3d pl. imperfect ind. for *κατεϝόρκοον. Ahrens, however (*Philologus*, xxxv., p. 34), prefers to write κατέϝορκον. This he refers to the same present, καταϝορκόω, but thinks that this verb has followed in Cyprian the same tendency as the contract verbs in Arcadian (*cf.* Arcadian ζαμιόντω, imperative from ζαμιόω Coll. 1222, 17; ζαμιόντες 1222, 50), and has passed over into the -μι class. But the Arcadian does not follow this tendency invariably, *e.g.* ζαμιώσθω (contract), not ζαμιό-σθω, Coll. 1222, 28; so that Deecke's reading seems altogether safer.

**2.** ἦς is given by Sayce (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 1884, No. 21), imperfect ind. 3d sing. from ἠμί. He gives only this form, apart from any context, and without reference to the certainty of the text. If correct it furnishes an interesting parallel to Arcadian ἦς (for *ἔ-εσ-τ, the primitive formation) Coll. 1222, 37. *Cf.* Bœotian παρεῖς (*i.e.* -ῆς) Coll. 500, 8.

**3.** ἐπισταῖς, Deecke's reading in Coll. 68, 3, would, if correct, be for ἐπισταίης, aor. opt., with the mode-sign of the

plural, ι, instead of that of the singular. But frequent as is the opposite phenomenon, that of -ιη- instead of ι in the dual and plural (*e.g.* σταίητον, σταίημεν), yet instances of the reverse are not elsewhere found, and we should be slow to credit one in the present case, the more so since the sense which Deecke gives this word (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 78, "nicht möchtest du dich über die Gottheit stellen" (μὴ . . . ἐπισταῖς . . . θεῶι), does not belong to ἐφίστημι, which may have the sense of 'to be in command of,' but not that of 'to hold oneself superior to.'

4. κατέθιϳαν Coll. 60, 27, is the plural of the unthematic aor. ind. of κατατίθημι. The root syllable appears as θι instead of θε- according to § 7, 1; on ϳ see § 18, 1, a. The ending is -αν. The normal formation would have been *κατέθεντ, *i.e.* κατέθεν. *Cf.* Arcadian ἀνέθεν Coll. 1229; 1230. The ending -αν has been borrowed from consonant stems, where the primitive ending -ντ became -ν̯τ and so developed regularly as -αν(τ), *e.g.* ἔδωκαν, for *ἐδωκῆ̯τ; ἔλυσαν for *ἐλυσῆ̯τ (see Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 530). Identical with Cyprian κατέθιϳαν are Bœotian ἀνέθε-αν and ἀνέθεϱ-αν Coll. 855; 571, 2.

5. κατέθισαν (Att. κατέθεσαν) Coll. 20, 2, ought regularly to appear as κατέθεσαν. The ι is to be explained as borrowed from the formation just mentioned, κατέθιϳαν. The termination is of secondary origin, as in case of the Att. κατέθεσαν, being borrowed from the sigmatic aor., *e.g.* ἔλυσαν, where -σαν was felt as ending. Voigt's suspicion of this form (*Bezz. Beitr.*, ix., p. 165) I am unable to share.

6. On the aor. ὡρίσετυ Coll. 126, 1 see § 3, 4.

7. On the ending η for ῃ in the 3d sing. of the aor. subjunctive, see § 12, 3, b.

8. In Coll. 60, 26, note, Deecke takes ἰναλαλισμένα as perfect pass. participle from ἰν-αλίζω (*i.e.* ἐν and ἁλιζω, from ἅλος, Att. ἧλος 'nail') hence 'nailed up,' 'suspended by a nail.' But this assumption of the so-called Attic reduplication in a verb beginning with a long vowel is unwarranted. Deecke and Siegismund's earlier reading in Curtius' *Studien*, vii., p. 255, ἰναλ(λ)αλισμένα (ϝέπιϳα) "diese ausgetauschten

Worte" (from *ἰν-αλ(λ)αλίζω*) still seems preferable, notwithstanding *αἴλων* in 60, 14.

**9.** *ἐρερᾱμένα* is Deecke's reading in Coll. 68, 2. He explains it (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 79) as perfect participle of *ἔρᾰμαι*, comparing *ἀλᾰ́λημαι*, *ἀλᾰλύκτημαι* for the reduplication. But the lengthening of *ᾰ* to *ᾱ* is unaccountable, and the use of so strong a word as *ἔραμαι* in the sense of "liebes," as Deecke takes it, would be remarkable. Homeric *ἦρα* in *ἦρα φέρειν*, which Deecke compares, probably has no etymological connection with *ἔραμαι*.

**10.** An infinitive ending *-ϝέναι* occurs in *δοϝέναι* (from *δίδωμι*) Coll. 60, 5, 15. *Cf.* Skrt. *dā-váne*. This ending is probably the original of that appearing in Attic *δοῦναι* (for **δο(ϝ)έναι*, *θεῖναι* (for **θε-(ϝ)έναι*). *δόμε(ν)* read by Deecke in Coll. 126, 2, is uncertain; § 23, 4.

**11.** The ending of the present infinitive of *-ω*-verbs is uncertain. Whether we should transcribe this as *-εν* or *-ην* cannot be determined. It is perhaps safest to follow the closely related Arcadian (*cf.* Arcadian *ἰμφαῖνεν* Coll. 1222, 24; *ὑπάρχεν* 1222, 53) and write *ἔχεν* in Cyprian in Coll. 60, 10, 22, where Deecke gives *ἔχην*. If we read *ἔχεν*, it is best to assume an independent infinitive suffix *-ν*, *i.e.* *ἔχ-ε-ν*, as is done by Spitzer (*Laut. Ark. Dial.*, p. 56) and Brugmann (*Griechische Grammatik*, § 146, 5) in case of the Arcadian and Doric forms.

**12.** Whether *κυμερῆναι*, Deecke's reading in Coll. 68, 4, may be a Cyprian infinitive, like the Homeric *φορῆναι*, from an assumed **κυμερέω* for **κυμεράω* — *i.e.* *κυβερνάω* (*cf.* *δαμάω* beside *δαμνάω*) as taken by Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 80) seems altogether doubtful; see § 24, 8.

**13.** The imperative *πῖθι* is found in Coll. 135.

**14.** *εὖ ποτε ἔϝρεξα* Coll. 71 is not properly a case of tmesis, as Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.*, vi., p. 152) takes it, since a form *εὐέϝρεξα* is an impossibility; but *ἐξ ὀρύξη* Coll. 60, 12 (twice), 24, 25, has in each of the four instances a divisor between the preposition and the verb.

**15.** The participles *ἰό(ν)τα* Coll. 60, 23, and *ἐπιό(ν)τα* 60,

9, 19, 22, *i.e.* ἐόντα ἐπεόντα (see § 7, 1 and *cf.* Ion. ἐών, ἐόντος) represent the thematic formation from the strong form of the root ἐσ-, in place of the primitive σ̥ήτ-, which has everywhere disappeared. *Cf.* Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*², § 601.

## 33.

### *Prepositions.*

1. ἀπύ (*i.e.* ἀπό; see § 9, 2) occurs in Cyprian with the dative only, *viz.* ἀπὺ ταῖ ζᾶι Coll. 60, 8, 17; ἀφ' ὧι 59, 3.

2. ἐξ is used before consonants as well as before vowels (see § 24, 1), and like ἀπύ governs the dative only. The examples are ἐξ τῶι χώρωι Coll. 60, 11; ἐξ ταῖ πτόλιϝι 60, 6; ἐξ τῶι ϝοίκωι 60, 5; ἐξ ταῖ ζᾶι 60, 24; ἐξ τῶι καπωι 60, 24. The form ἐκ does not occur.

3. πός. Reference has already been made above to the view of Baunack and Meister (see § 20, 3), according to which πός is a phonetic development from ποτί. The grounds for rejecting this view were also stated in the same connection. *Cf.* also Bechtel, *Bezz. Beitr.*, x., p. 287.

πός and ποτί are really independent of each other, being different formations from the same theme, *πότ. The former is for *πότ-ς, where -ς is the same suffix as seen in ἐξ (*i.e.* ἐκ-ς), and ἀψ- (*i.e.* ἀπ-ς-), probably the weak form of the gen. suffix -ες, -ος as seen in δεσπότης for δεμ-σ-πότης, Lat. *fructū-s* (*cf.* J. Strachan, *Abstufung in Case-Endings, Bezz. Beitr.*, xiv., p. 174). ποτ-ί, on the other hand, is a locative formation. With the relation existing between πός and ποτ-ί compare also that between πρός (*i.e.* *πρότ-ς) and προτ-ί; εἰς (*i.e.* *ἐν-ς) and ἐν-ί.

4. ὑ occurs in Coll. 74, 3, in the sense of ἐπί; also in composition in ὑευξάμενος (see § 17, 2 *ad fin.*) 45, 2; and ὑχήρων (*i.e.* ἐπιχείρου; see Ahrens, *Philologus*, xxxv., p. 30 ff.) 60, 5, 15.

5. In Coll. 60, 10, 22, 28 we also find the peculiar form ὕϝαις, which is plausibly explained by Baunack (*Inschrift von*

*Gortyn*, p. 44) as follows. From the preposition *ὑ* already mentioned (see **4**, above) was first formed *ὕ-αι*, the αι being the same suffix as seen in the Homeric *ὑπ-αί* and *παρ-αί* (*cf.* *ὑπαὶ πόδα νείατον* B 824; *παραὶ ποσίν* *o* 280), *etc.* This *ὕαι* appears in Cyprian as *ὕϝαι-ς*. The *ϝ* is parasitic (see § 17, 2). The *-ς* is the same suffix as that already mentioned in connection with *πός* and *πρός* (see above, **3**). *Cf.* also *μέχρι-ς* beside *μέχρι*; *ἀμφί-ς* beside *ἀμφί*; Elean *ἄνευ-ς* beside *ἄνευ* Coll. 1157.

The incorrectness of Ahrens' view, which connects *ὕϝαις* with the Skrt. adverbs in *-āis*, has already been shown above, § 11, 2.

**6.** *ἰ(ν)* (see § 23, 2, 4) governs the acc. as well as the dat., *e.g.* *ἰ(ν)* *τὰ(ν)* *θιόν* Coll. 60, 27; *ἰ(ν)* *τύχαι* 59, 4, and frequently.

## 34.

### *Conjunctions.*

**1.** On *ἦ* 'if' see § 14, 6. This is probably from the same root as the Doric *αἰ* and Att. *εἰ*, though the relations of the three forms to each other are obscure. Baunack (*Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 50) assumes a stem *sιϝο-* to which he refers *εἰ* (for **σϝεῖ*) as locative (*cf.* *οἴκει*) and *ἦ* (*i.e.* **σϝῆ*) as instrumental; also a stem *sιϝᾱ-* to which he refers *αἰ* (for **σϝαῖ*) as locative; *cf.* *χαμαί*.

**2.** *κάς* 'and' sometimes loses its final *-ς* and appears as *κά*, as already explained above; see § 20, 1. The relation of these forms to *καί* of the other dialects is obscure. Baunack (*Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 44) thinks that *καί* was the original form, which before vowels became *και̯*, then *κά*, and that this *κά* was extended to *κά-ς* by the addition of *-ς*, as in case of *μέχρι-ς* for *μέχρι*, *etc.* (see § 33, 5). But no traces of an antevocalic form *κά* are elsewhere found, and the addition of *-ς*, while frequent in adverbs and prepositions, is hardly to be assumed for a pure conjunction like *καί*. The explanation of *κάς* and *κά* is further complicated by the existence of the form *κατ'* Coll. 59, 1. Deecke (Index to Coll. I., p. 77)

suggests that the elided vowel is ι, *i.e.* κάτι. Hall (*Proceedings Am. Or. Soc.*, x., p. clviii.) suggests κά τε (*i.e.* καί τε) in the sense of the usual τε καί; but this is impossible.

Assuming with Deecke that κάτι was the full form of this word we are not justified in assuming that this developed to *κάσι and then to κάς (before vowels), since in that event we should not find κάτι and κάς side by side. Nor can we explain καί as developed from κάτι through the medium of *κάσι, since the secondary σ of the latter form would not have disappeared, but would have remained.

3. ἰδέ occurs Coll. 60, 12, 24, used like the apodotic δέ to introduce the conclusion of a conditional sentence. In 60, 26 it has the force of the simple δέ.

4. ἴ 'and' is found Coll. 60, 24.

5. πᾶι Coll. 60, 4; 60, 12; 71 is most naturally explained like the Attic πῃ as an instrumental which has assumed the ι secondarily. Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*,[2] § 388.